DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 099 SP 023 804

AUTHOR Edwards, Sara A.
TITLE Clinical Preservice Activities: Education, Development, Training--Three Case Studies. Clinical Teacher Education -- Preservice Series.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9023
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 117p.; For related documents, see SP 023 801, SP 023 803-806, and SP 023 813.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; *Individual Characteristics; Participant Satisfaction; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teachers; *Student Teacher Supervisors

ABSTRACT

This report is one in a series presenting findings from a major multi-site investigation into clinical preservice teacher education. The larger study makes available an in-depth description of participants, practice, and outcomes of the student teaching experience in two settings. This report presents, through three selected case studies, one facet of that comprehensive picture: a view of the idiosyncratic aspects of the experience as it is shaped by the individual characteristics of the participants in interaction within a specific context. Intensive examination of the experiences of these three student teaching situations indicated that: (1) There is a lack of an articulated, agreed-upon knowledge base regarding either the context and process of teaching or the content and process of training of the student teacher; (2) Personal characteristics of the members of the student teaching triad are highly predictive of the interactions and evaluations which take place in the clinical experience; and (3) Craft knowledge and "common sense" are the basis of most on-the-scene decisions regarding specific experiences and behaviors. Conclusions drawn from findings, and implications for practitioners and researchers, are included in the report. (Author/JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED240099

# CLINICAL PRESERVICE ACTIVITIES: EDUCATION, DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING

## - THREE CASE STUDIES -

Sara A. Edwards

Report No. 9023

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

To order additional copies of this report or a catalog of publications, contact Communication Services, Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, Education Annex 3.203, Austin, Texas 78712.

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

# CLINICAL PRESERVICE ACTIVITIES: EDUCATION, DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING
## - THREE CASE STUDIES -

Sara A. Edwards

Report No. 9023

This Publication is One of
a Series on
Clinical Teacher Education--Preservice

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director and
Principal Investigator

November 1982

Table of Contents

List of Tables . . . . . v

Abstract . . . . . .vii

Preface . . . . . .ix

Introduction . . . . . 1

Triad A "Pas de Deux". . . . . .11

Background . . . . . .12

Interpersonal Relationships . . . . . .12

Interactions and Perceptions . . . . . .14

Goals and Expectations . . . . . .17

External Observer Perception . . . . . .19

Interview Directed Focus . . . . . .20

Observations and Feedback . . . . . .23

Roll of University Supervisor . . . . . .24

ST Evaluations of US. . . . . .26

All Day Student Teaching. . . . . .27

After "All Day Teach" . . . . . .30

Conclusions . . . . . .31

Triad B "What We've got here is Crowd Control" . . . . . .33

Background . . . . . .33

Interpersonal Relationships . . . . . .35

Expectations, Evaluations and Satisfactions . . . . . .36

Interactions and Perceptions . . . . . .40

Focus of Pre-service Training . . . . . .50

Total Teach . . . . . .53

Conclusion . . . . . .58

Triad C "Praise the Lord" and "Nit-picking" . . . . . .60
Background . . . . . .61
Interpersonal Relationships . . . . . .62
Expectations, Perceptions and Satisfactions . . . . . .65
Focus of the Training: Experience and "Nit-picking" . . . . . .69
Conclusions . . . . . .82
Comparison of Triads . . . . . .83
Personal Characteristics . . . . . .84
Outcomes: Satisfaction, Expectation, Evaluations . . . . . .86
General Conclusions . . . . . .88
References . . . . . .91
Appendix A . . . . . .93

## List of Tables

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Paragraph Completion Test and Scores of Selected Triads

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Empathy Construct Rating Scale and Scores of Selected Triads

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Different Situations Adaptation Scale (Flexibility) and Scores of Selected Triads

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of the Self-Perception Inventory (Self-Esteem) and Scores of Selected Triads

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Student Teacher Expectations and Satisfaction Scales and Scores of Selected Triads

## Abstract

This report is one in a series presenting findings from a major multi-site investigation into clinical pre-service teacher education. The larger study makes available an in-depth description of participants, practices, and outcomes of the student teaching experience in two settings. This report presents through three selected case studies one facet of that comprehensive picture: a view of the idiosyncratic aspects of the experience as it is shaped by the individual characteristics of the participants in interaction within a specific context. Intensive examination of the experiences of these three student teaching situations indicated: (1) that there is a lack of any articulated, agreed-to knowledge base regarding either the context and process of teaching or the content and process of training of the student teacher, (2) that personal characteristics of the members of the triad are highly predictive of the interactions and evaluations which take place in the clinical experience, and (3) that craft knowledge and "common sense" are the basis of most on-the-scene decisions regarding specific experiences and behaviors. Conclusions drawn from findings, and implications for practitioners and researchers are included in the report.

## Preface

The role of the teacher in American society has undergone significant changes during the past several decades. Concurrently, teacher education programs have also changed. These changes have included attention to behaviorism, increased sensitivity to accountability, a sharper focus upon pedagogical variety, pendulum shifts from humanism to demonstrated (and observable) competence, and so on. In some cases the changes have persisted and in others the innovations of yesterday have become the ghosts of today's memories.

One aspect of teacher education which has remained relatively constant, in procedural if not substantive terms, is student teaching. This clinical component of the education of teachers-to-be is still seen in most higher education institutions as the capstone of the teacher education professional sequence. And, as such, it has acquired a programmatic status not enjoyed to any large degree by any other aspects of teacher education programs.

This report examines the student teaching experience from a unique perspective -- the inside out. The case studies presented here emerged from several data bases which were composed of participants' words and actions. In addition, the case studies were informed by responses from an orchestrated set of instruments which were used to make better sense of what occurred during these instances of clinical teacher education.

This report was written by Sara Edwards, whose sensitive eye and analytical intelligence acted together to capture the essence of the experience from a particular point of view. But the report could not have been written without the active cooperation of others on the research team. Data were collected and analyzed by G. Robert Hughes, Jr., Susan Barnes, Sharon O'Neal, Maria Defino, Hobart Hukill, Heather Carter, Hugh Munby, and

Lupita Guzman. Our work was greatly aided by Linda Mora, Freddie Green, Vicky Rodgers, and Luann McLarry.

Although it has become almost trite to offer the conventional appreciation to subjects in a research effort, the participants in this study deserve our gratitude. They allowed us to become part of their professional lives for a full academic semester and responded to our queries and adopted our research procedures with grace. We are indebted to them.

This report is one of a series dealing with clinical preservice teacher education. The investigations which are reported in the series were conducted by the research team of the Research in Teacher Education program area of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin. Inquiries about related reports can be directed to Communication Services, Research and Development Center, Education Annex, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712.

Gary A. Griffin
Principal Investigator

Clinical Preservice Activities: Education, Development, Training

- Three Case Studies -

## Introduction

In Benton Harbor, Michigan, 400 5-, 6-, and 7-year olds were failed because they could not "measure up" in basic math and reading skills (Austin American-Statesman, 1982). It "had to be done" because, as the superintendent explained, the school was there to "do a job." In Austin, Texas, two elementary teachers left the profession because they "could not walk through that classroom door one more time without anguish" (Austin American-Statesman, 1982). In Benton Harbor "performance standards" were established and 459 of the 2,083 kindergarten through second grade pupils failed. In Austin, a first grade teacher, resigning after 10 years of experience, said "Everything is so rote and standardized. It's like they try to plan a standardized ideal classroom and a standardized, ideal teacher. Children aren't products and shouldn't be cranked out in a streamlined factory approach."

"We're here," said the Michigan superintendent, "to do a job."

"They're fearful," said the Austin ex-teacher "about proving to everybody that they're doing their job."

The conflict between these views of teaching and educating persons or "doing a job" is reflected in the student teaching experience, reinforcing the need for careful study in this area. The preservice program itself appears to be bifurcated, its branches sometimes in congruence and sometimes in contradiction. One concept of the clinical preservice experience is the training of students teachers for "teaching as a job," with major responsibility for controlling group behavior. An alternate concept is the educating of student teachers for "teaching as a mission," a special

relationship of guiding an individual in interaction with an appropriately manipulated environment, encouraging and facilitating introspective analysis of that interactive experience in order that the individual may "learn," i.e., may increase both in knowledge and in the ability to process and make use of that knowledge. Within the first concept it is necessary for student teachers to accept "ends" as given, something over which they have no control; training is focused on matching means to ends so that available resources are most efficiently directed. The goal of the training is to increase the student teachers' ability to manipulate and control the behavior of student groups in order to achieve organizationally predetermined ends. "Effectiveness" is measured in terms of economical and efficient use of means in producing organizational products. In the second instance, student teachers must consider "ends," make judgments, analyze those ends and judgments, and accept responsibility for their own judgements and actions. Different kinds of knowledge and skills are required for each purpose.

In the fall of 1981 the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program area of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin conducted a major investigation of preservice clinical teacher education. The overall purpose of the study (Griffin, et al.,1981) was to make available an in-depth description of participants, practices, and outcomes of the student teaching experience in two settings. The present report presents through three selected case studies one facet of the resulting comprehensive picture. The case studies provide a view of the idiosyncratic aspect of the student teaching experience as it is shaped by the individual characteristics of the participants in interaction within a specific context.

The complete sample for the RITE study included 88 cooperating teachers, 93 student teachers, and 17 university supervisors for a total of 198

participants. The intensive sample was made up of 20 student teachers and 20 cooperating teachers, and nine university supervisors. Data collected on the intensive sample were much more intensive than those collected on the general sample. The three triads selected for this report were taken from the intensive sample because there was more information from which to draw in presenting a detailed description. The cases studies provide a view of the ongoing process of the field experience and identify some specific kinds of experiences which occur and the apparent effects of those experiences.

Data from four instruments administered during the RITE study were used to assess the relative positions of the selected case studies' members on scales measuring Conceptual Level (Table 1), Empathy (Table 2), Flexibility (Table 3), and Self-Perception (Table 4). Differences across triads in the scores of the cooperating teachers and the student teachers on these scales were discussed in conjunction with descriptions of the interactions taking place among members of each triad as they progressed through the student teaching experience.

Student teachers (STs) enter the clinical preservice experience with intentions and expectations which generate actions and responses. These intentions and expectations presuppose some body of beliefs held by the student teachers. Cooperating teachers (CTs) assume their responsibilities in clinical preservice teacher education with intentions and expectations which generate their actions and responses, and which, as with the student teachers, presuppose some body of belief, some world view, explicit or implicit. The same holds true for the university supervisors (USs). The process of the clinical experience involves the interactions of these three persons in the context of the elementary or secondary school. In these interactions evaluation, decision-making, and action are directed toward the creation of a

Table 1

Paragraph Completion Test (PCT)
Conceptual Level (CL)

Means and Standard Deviations of
Sample Case Study Scores

University Supervisors' Scores

| | Means | | Standard Deviation | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | First | Second | First | Second | US |
| Total US Sample N=17 | 1.824 | 1.812 | .567 | .427 | |
| | Scores | | | | |
| US A | 1.2 | 2.0 | | | |
| US B | 1.25 | 1.8 | | | |
| US C | 2.8 | 2.0 | | | |

Cooperating Teachers' Scores

| | Means | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total CT Sample N=85 | 1.483 | 1.456 | .429 | .370 |
| | Scores | | | |
| CT A | 1.8 | 2.4 | | |
| CT B | 2.0 | 1.6 | | |
| CT C | 1.2 | 1.0 | | |

Student Teachers' Scores

| | Means | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total ST Sample N=85 | 1.441 | 1.414 | .350 | .343 |
| | Scores | | | |
| ST A | 1.6 | 2.0 | | |
| ST B | 1.2 | 1.2 | | |
| ST C | 1.2 | 1.4 | | |

Comparison of Scores by Triads

| | US | | CT | | ST | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | First | Second | First | Second | First | Second |
| Triad A | 1.2 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 2.0 |
| Triad B | 1.25 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Triad C | 2.8 | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.4 |

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of the

Empathy Construct Rating Scale

| Intensive Sample | Administrations | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning-of-Semester | | Mid-Semester | | End-of-Semester | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| University Supervisor (n=9) | 128.89 | 8.85 | 128.33 | 9.38 | 129.22 | 9.19 |
| Cooperating Teacher (n=20) | 123.95 | 10.13 | 121.30 | 13.18 | 121.75 | 12.59 |
| Student Teacher (n=20) | 124.95 | 10.53 | 122.60 | 13.43 | 123.90 | 10.61 |

| | Scores of Selected Triads | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Score | Score | Score |
| Triad A | | | |
| University Supervisor | 135 | 133 | 134 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 135 | 137 | 135 |
| Student Teacher | 138 | 137 | 136 |
| Triad B | | | |
| University Supervisor | 124 | 110 | 117 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 110 | 98 | 116 |
| Student Teacher | 110 | 96 | 111 |
| Triad C | | | |
| University Supervisor | 136 | 136 | 137 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 132 | 132 | 130 |
| Student Teacher | 126 | 126 | 119 |

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of the

Different Situations Adaptation Scale (Flexibility)

| Intensive Sample | Administrations | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning-of-Semester | | Mid-Semester | | End-of-Semester | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| University Supervisor (n=9) | 74.56 | 9.93 | 77.11 | 8.25 | 77.67 | 5.32 |
| Cooperating Teacher (n=20) | 70.95 | 11.56 | 74.00 | 12.91 | 76.70 | 12.46 |
| Student Teacher (n=20) | 74.30 | 9.04 | 75.50 | 9.87 | 75.10 | 10.14 |

| | Scores of Selected Triads | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Score | Score | Score |
| Triad A | | | |
| University Supervisor | 75 | 81 | 81 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 93 | 99 | 96 |
| Student Teacher | 79 | 77 | 75 |
| Triad B | | | |
| University Supervisor | 75 | 73 | 78 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 60 | 68 | 69 |
| Student Teacher | 56 | 64 | 57 |
| Triad C | | | |
| University Supervisor | 66 | 78 | 79 |
| Cooperating Teacher | 85 | 86 | 83 |
| Student Teacher | 69 | 68 | 72 |

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of the

Self-Perception Inventory (Self-Esteem)

| Intensive Sample | Administrations | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Beginning-of-Semester | | Mid-Semester | | End-of-Semester | |
| | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| University Supervisor (n=9) | 126.00 | 10.93 | 125.67 | 9.04 | 125.67 | 10.71 |
| Cooperating Teacher (n=20) | 123.89 | 11.24 | 124.85 | 10.85 | 122.00 | 12.30 |
| Student Teacher (n=20) | 121.65 | 10.62 | 123.30 | 10.53 | 124.45 | 9.83 |
| | Scores of Selected Triads | | | | | |
| | Score | | Score | | Score | |
| Triad A | | | | | | |
| University Supervisor | 116 | | 123 | | 132 | |
| Cooperating Teacher | 129 | | 138 | | 131 | |
| Student Teacher | 135 | | 134 | | 135 | |
| Triad B | | | | | | |
| University Supervisor | 125 | | 125 | | 117 | |
| Cooperating Teacher | --- | | 107 | | 89 | |
| Student Teacher | 103 | | 101 | | 107 | |
| Triad C | | | | | | |
| University Supervisor | 126 | | 128 | | 123 | |
| Cooperating Teacher | 136 | | 112 | | 129 | |
| Student Teacher | 118 | | 123 | | 125 | |

good and effective experience. A persistent concern held by RITE staff in conduction this study was the issue of what outcome measures are most appropriate in determining effectiveness of clinical teacher education opportunities. Three "outcomes" considered as significant in the study were the student teachers' satisfaction with the experience (Table 5), the degree to which their expectations were met (Table 5), and the evaluations of the STs by the CTs and the USs. These outcome measures from the RITE study are discussed for each of the triads in the case studies.

Descriptions of the interactions among members of each triad are based on self-report information in journals kept by each member, interview responses of each member, recorded conferences between triad members, and narratives of classroom observations make by the RITE staff. These qualitative data (observations, interviews, conferences, and journal entries) covering a period of three months starting with the first day of the student teaching experience provide a rich source of information about interactions and perceptions of the members of the triad. It is from these data that the case studies can identify specific kinds of experiences and link those experiences with outcomes against the context of the quantitative data collected during the study.

Calling for more rigorous and systematic study of the student teaching field placement experience, Becher (1982) emphasizes Zeichner's contention that although the question of what constitutes a good field experience and/or placement is important and persistent, "there is at present almost no research which has attempted to identify how, why, or what specific kinds of experiences do actually have demonstrably positive effects" (p. 24-25). Applegate (1982), suggesting that the tacit assumption that experience is the best teacher underlies pedagogical and political rhetoric regarding preservice

Table 5

Student Teacher Expectations and Satisfaction

Means and Standard Deviations

| Items | Mean | Standard Deviation | ST A | ST B | ST C |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Satisfaction (ST) | 90.72 | 12.01 | 92 | 90 | 101 |

The higher the score, the greater the degree of satisfaction.

| Expectations (ST) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Orientation | 15.45 | 3.84 | 19 | 20 | 19 |
| 2. Competence | 10.43 | 3.72 | 8 | 14 | 7 |
| 3. Time | 31.87 | 6.42 | 38 | 30 | 28 |
| 4. Courses | 2.41 | .84 | 2 | 3 | 1.6 |

1, 2, 4 - the lower the score, the greater the degree to which expectations were met or exceeded.

3 - the higher the score, the smaller the amount of time spent compared to the amount of time expected to be required.

field education, notes the absence of reported studies regarding the nature of the problems confronting cooperating teachers. Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall (1981) argue strongly for a cognitive-developmental approach to the study. Citing the work of numerous developmentalists, they advocate consideration of the approach as providing a possible dual focus framework representing a synthesis of specific behavioral teaching skills and general human development. Work in progress by Thies-Sprinthall, attempting to "raise the (cooperating) teacher's developmental stage" (p. 51), is based on the authors' conviction that "the higher stage teacher is more adequate as an instructor and can meet the needs of a broader group of pupils," and "the higher stage supervisor may be capable of providing different levels of supervision according to the needs of the student teacher," (p. 51).

There appears to be general agreement that the classroom is a context in which complex decision-making is interfaced with intense and prolonged interpersonal relations. Thus flexibility and integrative complexity are important components of more adequate classroom functioning (Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall, 1980). It seems reasonable to argue then that conceptual growth is a highly desirable outcome of the student teaching experience and may be one criterion for assessing the value of the field placement experience.

Within the intensive sample of the RITE study there were triads in which conceptual growth during the student teaching experience was indicated by the difference in scores on the pre- and post-administrations of the Paragraph Completion Test (PCT). There were also triads for which the scores indicated no growth or even regression. Since there was no intentional intervention to which the indicated growth could be attributed, it seems both useful and desirable to compare factors present in a "growth" triad to those present in

triads identified by members' scores on the PCT as indicating "no growth" or "regression."

The "growth" triad identified for the case study was selected because all three members made score gains (Table 1) from the first to the final administration of the instrument. Two triads were selected for comparison with the growth triad on the basis of members' scores on the PCT (Table 1) which indicated that there was either regression or no change in conceptual level functioning of a least two of the members of the triad over the period of the student teaching experience.

For purposes of comparison and clarity, the case studies are presented in the following manner. The triads are designated "A" for the "growth" triad, "B" and "C" for the triads selected for comparison. The growth triad is described, interactions among its members discussed, and conclusions stated. The two triads, "B" and "C" are then described in sequence, with the nature of the interactions of the members of each triad considered. The three triads are then compared, and some general conclusions are drawn.

## Triad A

## "Pas de Deux"

The interactions of the ST and the CT in Triad A during the clinical experience might well be characterized as a dance for two. From the beginning both the CT and the ST emphasized and stressed their perception of a mutual relationship of "equals" with responsibilities for contributing to the development and support of the students in the classroom. They moved together, initiating, reacting, encouraging, supporting and reinforcing patterns of classroom behavior mutually viewed as good teaching which they believed would lead to or result in "right outcomes" in students.

Background

The student teacher member of the triad is an Anglo female, 21 years of age, who grew up in a predominately Anglo middle SES suburban environment, attending schools with a similar profile. Her father was in the military and her mother a housewife. The cooperating teacher, an Anglo female, 49 years old, who identified her father's occupation as "con man," reported that the family had moved about with great frequency, living in low to middle SES racially mixed areas where she attended schools of the same profile. The university supervisor is a female, 58 years of age, who grew up in an urban middle SES environment and attended an upper middle SES high school that was predominately Anglo.

The school in which the clinical experience took place was a low SES inner city school in a large city. Approximately 40% of the class was Black, 40% Hispanic, and 20% Anglo and Asian.

Interpersonal Relationships

In terms of interpersonal relationships within the triad, the ST seemed to view the relationship with the CT as one of commitment, trust, security or predictability, and intimacy. These perceptions appeared to be related to responsible risk-taking and introspective critical analysis. And the ST saw the CT as a great influence in her field experience. The ST viewed the US in terms of a professional relationship with specific responsibilities for which each would be held accountable. In interpersonal terms the ST viewed the relationship with the US as unpredictable, lacking in intimacy, with little sense of commitment. These perceptions appeared to be related to task-oriented, situation specific responses. The ST's expressed satisfaction with the experience was only slightly higher than the mean of the student teacher sample (Table 5). The score of ST on the Orientation section of the

Expectation Scale suggests that she liked teaching related activities about as well as she had expected when she entered the program. The mean of the sample on this item suggested that the STs tended to experience a greater degree of "liking" than they had expected. In terms of competence, the ST indicated that she had experienced her performance as a teacher to be better than she had expected it would be, which was consistent with the experience of the other STs in the sample. The ST indicated that she had spent less time than she had expected to spend on student teaching related activities; the mean of the sample on this item indicated that STs as a group spent more time on student teaching related activities than they had expected to spend.

In the final evaluations of the ST by both the CT and the US, all factors were marked with the highest possible numerical rating. The CT listed three specific accomplishments: (1) provided individual assignments; (2) kept track of what was going on; (3) saw that students completed assignments. The remainder of the evaluation enumerated these more general characteristics of the ST: (1) enthusiastic; (2) hardworking; (3) friendly; (4) flexible; (5) sense of humor; (6) wonderful perspective about teaching; and (7) positive manner. The narrative concluded with the notation that ST was "terrific."

Both the ST and the US were asked to evaluate the CT by indicating their degree of agreement or disagreement with a list of statements regarding various aspects of the cooperating teacher's performance. Both were in agreement that the CT was competent, helpful and successful in carrying out her responsibilities. On only four of the 14 statements did the US express less than the highest rating of the cooperating teacher's performance. She marked neutral in responding to the statement that the CT modeled a variety of teaching methods and techniques in her own teaching, and indicated less than strong agreement that the CT allowed the ST to develop her own style of

teaching, and that the CT provided specific feedback on the university supervisor's performance. The US agreed, but not strongly, with the statement that the CT provided her with encouragement for her work with the ST. In marking her reaction to 11 statements regarding the performance of the cooperating teacher, the ST indicated strong positive evaluation of the CT's performance in all areas except two and in those two the evaluation was still positive.

Interactions and Perceptions

The CT and the ST met for the first time at a general orientation meeting held the day before classes began. The ST and US met for the first time on the same day. All three participants recorded their impressions in their journals. The US noted that she had "allayed the fears" of the ST who had questions regarding her assignment and her participation in the RITE study. The CT noted that the ST had volunteered to help set up the classroom for the class and was "really a help and certainly willing to work." The ST noted that since she had some time before class she offered to help CT continue setting up the classroom. Both CT and ST noted positively the opportunity they had to talk; the CT perceived the discussion as her telling the ST about the materials and the philosophy regarding their use as they arranged the classroom and listening to the ST tell about previous experiences with children. The ST recorded "we talked about ourselves a bit. We both had traveled much in childhood." Their personal reactions were equally positive: the CT predicting "we're going to get along perfectly;" the ST recording "as soon as we were introduced I took an intense liking to her. . .I'm so lucky to have been placed with her." The CT attributed two characteristics to the ST: ambition (she has several part-time jobs) and being up-front (she asked to set up compensatory time in order to have additional vacation time). The ST

mentioned the "sincerity, down-to-earthness, vitality and warmth" of the CT, and labeled her "dedicated, open, assertive, honest and extremely friendly." Both journal entries and interviews offer evidence that this mutual admiration continued throughout the clinical experience.

The ST reported that the CT told her that the two of them would be "equals," the ST being the primary teacher when a substitute was present. The ST returns to this theme of "equality" continually throughout the experience, explaining, defining, elaborating, defending, equating it to having "responsibility" which she states "will really be the best learning experience."

The ST experienced the first day of class as "much too nerve-wracking" but definitely a "highlight" in her life. The time management issue surfaced immediately. She got to school early to help the CT "do last minute things" and reported that it was "nice to have time to go over what to expect during the morning." But in reporting on the second day's experience, the ST said she had been unable to arrive before her assigned time although the CT had asked her to arrive early. She expressed concern that as a result of her voluntary "early start" on the first day, the CT might expect her to be 15-30 minutes early every day. The ST appears to perceive her personal need in conflict with this perceived expectation of the CT: "my life is extremely busy and I can't get up before 6:00 a.m." The ST reacted to the conflict in a manner that emerges as typical: "Oh, well, I'll do what I can." The question of the arrival time of the ST does not arise again.

The ST related four situations that occurred during the first three days and her perceptions and reactions to the situations. First, a parent came in to warn them about the bad behavior of his daughter. The ST expressed disagreement with the CT's perception of the incident. Whereas the CT felt

the parent "set a negative impression for us," the ST noted that people's comments don't impress her all that much as "I assess things for myself." This assertion is interesting in that, throughout the clinical experience, the ST relies on the comments of the CT for evaluation of situations and performance rather than assessing things for herself. Her comments often point out differences between what she does or would do and what she perceives the CT wishes her to do. The second incident the ST reported was that on the first day several of the students who had known her in a previous setting "latched onto" her at recess. Fearing that this might "bother" the CT, she "sent them off to play" so she and the CT could talk. In noting this situation the ST mentioned that the CT was "blunt about how to do things, which didn't bother me," and that the CT seemed "patient but not as warm with kids as I'd expected her to be."

In her journal entry for the following day, the ST reported, "CT did mention the children's physical attachment to me but she approached it by not making me at fault. She explained how the children need to learn independence and be able to go out and play by themselves." The ST apparently accepted the reasoning as she "peeled off persistent grasps" going to recess and lunch, feeling, she reported "like I was rejecting them." Her resolution was similar to "I'll do what I can." She explained to them that she would "love to give them a hug and receive a hug" but didn't want them "hanging" on her. "I think they'll soon learn," she wrote. The CT had also asked the ST to sit off to one side during class so that students would not talk to her when CT was leading the lesson.

Thirdly, "another assessment of the first day showed how the kids sometimes played us off against each other." ST told a child to put a ball in the closet. The child had started to obey when the CT stopped her with "what

did I tell you? [ST] didn't hear me tell you. Do what I said." The ST's comment on this situation was "that upfrontness put me on the same level with the CT and I really appreciated that. It also clarified the communication process to the child."

In the last of the four reported incidents, the ST wrote that she had returned to the school to pick up two first graders for their parents. "My students saw me as they were leaving and the CT didn't seem too pleased with the attention I got. I'll talk to her tomorrow about it."

The ST noted after the second day, "CT is super low-key. She remains softspoken and can still be firm and humorous. Her quieter tones tend to keep the class quieter--a good technique. She also explains everything such as why she must put on glasses to read--that is something I think I will really learn from in modeling." The US and the observers from the RITE research team also mention the quiet, softspoken manner of the CT.

The US came by the class on the first day but neither the CT nor the ST mention her visit. This is consistent with their lack of attention to her presence during the entire experience.

Goals and Expectations

The CT's second journal entry focused on goals and expectations. She feels that the ST's "biggest job" is to become acquainted with the children, the class routines and manner of dealing with problems (taking class to lunch, to bathroom, etc.) so that when lessons start she will not have to worry about those kinds of things. CT indicates ST is "doing a good job" and "seems comfortable with my style of teaching." The CT notes that all the STs she has had seemed to like her way of teaching, but some "have more trouble than others in executing this style."

The CT makes a comment which is indicative of her stated focus in the clinical experience training: "The hardest thing is to get students in a position of being able to make decisions about individual children without doing it for them! I'll keep working on that." This "position" appears to represent an intuitive state which is attained through personal experience. The gap between the content of the assertion and the force of any articulated knowledge base is not bridged in the training period. The two instances described by the ST illustrate this distinction. Instance: The child with the ball was expected to obey the first command given when two equal authorities gave differing orders. Assumption: Students are to acquire particular correct responses. Instance: The children who clung to the ST had to be "peeled off" and "sent away." Assumption: Students are to learn independence.

By the end of the fourth day of class the ST writes in her journal, "CT and I are getting into a comfortable routine, she explains the day's events, what she expects of me, asks for feedback, and continues to give me new experiences and insights." She noted that the CT "is very thorough and clear when defining rules. A very good model." The CT has allowed the ST to make a ditto of the class roster, an assignment which the ST appreciated because it allowed ST to show her ability to "be neat and precise." In journal entries during the semester the ST mentions her desire to have her abilities recognized and appreciated and frequently mentions her appreciation of the CT. ST reports she feels that CT is moving her toward more control of the class. She is a bit "afraid" of the responsibility but thinks the CT is gradually preparing her and giving her confidence. The importance attached to confidence appears repeatedly in the notations of both the CT and ST. ST says "what scares me most is whether I will be creative enough or plan lessons with

enough educational value." Creativity and educational value seem to be unarticulated, undefined concepts of great importance which are understood and agreed to but which lack both content and process by which they can be directly taught.

During the second week ST had responsibility for routine tasks, bringing children into the room in the morning and after recess. She wrote in her journal that she "felt comfortable" having control of the class and working with small groups of students. One of the specific behaviors which the CT required and which the ST worked to perfect is glancing around the class and observing students while she is working with a small group. This skill is emphasized repeatedly by the CT. "At one point," the ST wrote, "I asked a group near where my table was working to try and play a little quieter and the CT saw me do this and commented on my doing so later. I was pleased that she saw and brought it up later." ST reported that CT had made extremely positive comments about her lesson plan which made her "glow with pride," because "I like to know when I'm doing a good job."

Writing in her journal on the same day, the CT described the ST's work as "reading the story to the children and working with individuals during reading and math times." CT reports that ST seems well received by the children who turn to her readily which is "all the more reason for her to know what to do and not have to ask me" even though "she is very willing to ask me questions--why do I do this and that, etc." CT notes that she appreciates this about the ST.

External Observer Perception

Eight days after the first day of class the CT was observed by a member of the RITE staff. Instruction was individualized and the observer noted that the students appeared to know exactly what to do. There were many different

activities going on focused on language acquisition. Students were free to walk about the room and converse with each other. CT moved about the room and gave instructions in a very quiet voice telling the class when it was time to move from individual activity to group work. ST works with a small group of students. Activities involving the total class were conducted with the students clustered on a rug before the CT who was seated in a straightbacked chair. This pattern of alternating between individualized student work with the teacher circulating among the students or working with small group and large group teacher-led instruction with students seated on the floor in front of the seated teacher was followed consistently throughout the semester. The teacher directed the changes and urged students to follow specified procedures for them.

During the individualized activity time as the CT and ST circulated about the room they met occasionally for brief verbal exchanges. Both CT and ST referred to these exchanges as "conferences" and both regarded them as highly valuable to teaching and to the training of the student teacher. The CT felt that it provided opportunity for immediate feedback and for directing the ST's attention to specific incidents. The ST felt that it provided moments of mutuality, or equality, which included "the joy" of sharing observations of students' accomplishments.

Interview Directed Focus

In interviews by a RITE staff member conducted eight days after the first day of class the ST and CT expressed their expectations and views on teaching and learning. Their responses indicated feelings similar to those expressed in their journals and a sense of agreement between the two of them but lacked objective specifics, focusing on intuitive perceptions based on generalized premises. The ST expected to gain satisfaction "in the feeling that the kids

have learned something...that a child has actually attained something that I've given them...sometimes it's just like things all click...or something that I have kind of initiated or motivated." The CT liked best "making a difference in people's lives, seeing something happen positively with the children." The ST expected to be most frustrated by being unable to intervene for good in the personal lives of students who had severe personal problems. The CT most disliked paperwork and mandates that interfered with her pursuing the course with the students which she perceived as "meeting the needs of the children."

In response to the question "what do you do best?" the ST said she was enthusiastic and could motivate and gave a lot of care and warmth. Answering about herself, the CT said that she could meet the needs of individual students and support and encourage them. The key to the whole essence of teaching according to the CT is "independence and having them feel good about themselves." The most valuable thing that the ST felt a teacher can do is "instilling independence and confidence and self-motivation." The CT saw herself as an "informal teacher," and her responsibility as a CT "seeing that the ST becomes the best teacher possible. The ST must find her own style that doesn't hurt children and be supportive of kids and other adults." The CT said that a cooperating teacher needs to be supportive of the student teacher and foster the feeling that the CT and ST are working together and heading for the same thing, but each in a different way, because "there are different points of view so that there are different ways of doing things and those are okay." This perception, acted out in her relations with the ST, gave the ST support and opportunity for experimentation and risk-taking, but the absence of any context for analysis and evaluation left the ST dependent on CT's reaction and her own feelings for decision making and action. Instruction, to

the ST, meant "things are going on" and "getting done" in a relatively quiet environment where the control is not "total" to the point that students feel fear, where some "social interaction takes place during work time." The perception was evident in the continuing concern expressed by the ST throughout the semester that the students have "something to do" at all times. Both ST and CT apparently agreed that all students must be "doing something" at all times and there was an ongoing concern expressed that enough "somethings" be available to fill class time. There was a lack of clarity regarding ends-in-view of the "somethings," or even of the process of perpetual activity; there was a groping, situation-specific approach to the development and preparation of activities, and a constant pressure to keep using more out-of-class time to "get things ready" to do in class.

Throughout the period of the study the CT continually and continuously stressed that her decisions regarding both content and process of teaching were determined by her assessment of the needs of the learners. This assertion was modified by one exception. In the first interview she explained that content of her instruction accommodated school expectations and/or requirements. The example she gave was the reading curriculum. The school used the Houghton-Mifflin "stuff," so the CT "infiltrates" it in order to avoid having a student reach the next grade and "apparently look like he or she didn't do anything in reading because he/she didn't use Houghton-Mifflin. . .You can teach science, music, those kinds of things with anything, even reading--you don't need a specific series or a specific unit. It's processing. I'm very process-oriented and the content is of very, very little consequence to me," the CT reports to the interviewer at the beginning of the student teaching experience. And in an interview conducted at mid-semester, the ST reported success with conducting class "activities" but expressed

difficulty in knowing what the kids needed to be learning. She still had to get specific directions from CT: "Work with these kids on these skills," in order to make lesson plans. "I don't know what skills they really need to be working on...it's really hard for me to know if they should be working with contractions or whatever...I guess I don't know enough about education or teachers' workbooks." The CT said in the first interview that the instructional skills of student teachers are limited and insufficient. "I don't sense that they see the whole curriculum."

Observations and Feedback

The CT reported she does very little formal observation of ST. When ST is conducting a lesson CT "gets out of her way" and "works with children. I observe across the room a lot and I teach her to observe the room a lot...She is just as responsible for the room as I am." CT reported that she told ST that "seeing" is important. "One of the things we are working on right now is for ST to be aware of the whole room." According to the CT, a teacher must be able to sense when it is too noisy in some area of the classroom or when some learning activity is inappropriate or a child is not doing something he has been told to do...It is essential she stated to "find ways to stop for a moment without interrupting a lesson, finding the right time to stop and slide out and slide back...that is part of the management of an informal classroom." This classroom management by "sense" or "feel" was questioned by a RITE observer who described the result of this approach as "chaos," with kids "all over the place," some of whom argue, dance, leap into walls or wander aimlessly about, apparently unobserved by the CT and ST.

Other than a desire for more feedback, particularly in written form, the student teacher seemed to regard the training provided by the cooperating teacher as wholly and totally sufficient and successful. The cooperating

teacher in turn appeared to regard the student teacher as fully competent and capable in terms of teaching and as superior in terms of personal characteristics.

Role of US

Both the CT and ST appeared to regard the US as a necessary but not particularly significant factor in the student teaching process, and both seemed to regard this particular supervisor as less than superior in terms of ability and personal characteristics. The US appeared to regard the CT as exceptionally capable and well qualified, "thorough, helpful, and supportive of associates." The US "visited" the student teacher in the classroom toward the end of September and noted in her journal that ST was "not teaching" but was "assisting the learners" in the individualized setting. US wrote that the ST

> enjoys it [being in a second grade classroom where the organization and instruction is all individualized] and appears to have adjusted and adapted her lesson to it. She is quite capable, her supervising teacher is very thorough and most helpful and supportive of her associates. "I anticipate giving (ST) very little assistance, as she appears to know what she's doing and what teaching is all about.

About three weeks later the US observed ST again and reported both she and CT felt ST was doing an outstanding job. ST had presented an art lesson to a small group, showing them how to do origami paper folding. US reported that she had judged the lesson to be so successful that she complimented ST and did not have a conference or give a written evaluation. In her journal entry dated one week later the US reported observing the ST leading a short directed reading lesson to a small group at one table. The ST was "so well organized

and prepared" that the US had "little guidance to give her," The US wrote that she felt she was doing "absolute nothing" to help ST.

At the end of one and a half months the US again observed ST and reported that as the CT had been "upset" before class began she (US) had suggested to ST to "take" the class, which the ST did "without a blink and conducted it like an old pro" while the US sat and checked the student teaching notebooks and wrote the following note to the ST.

> Your soft way with the class is great. You are positive, show you care and relate well to the learners. In turn you have earned their respect. You are doing an outstanding job. I am so glad that you are with CT. I like the way you are aware of the total situation. Nothing gets by you.
>
> Take Care!

This is the final journal entry from US regarding this ST. A check of her journal entries regarding other STs for whom she was responsible confirmed the perception that US regarded her responsibility as "being available" and intervening only when problems were reported to her. Writing about her observation of another ST, the US noted that he volunteered to help with a situation and she told him that he would receive "brownie points" for such behavior. She wrote that since there were "no problems" there was no reason for a conference. "The only reason I make visitations is so ST knows I am available for assistance and that I care." In the one case where a CT had reported a problem to the US, the US had observed and conferenced with the ST. The ST had "trouble with whole class control" and the US advised her to (1) circulate and observe, standing by misbehaving students; (2) have some student instructed to remind her of the time so she could keep on schedule; and, (3)

"be prepared for anything happening (as it will)." In addition, US told ST to take initiative, and not wait for CT to have to tell her what to do.

ST Evaluations of US

> In a mid-semester interview the ST discussed her perceptions of the US. She doesn't seem to have as much influence as she is supposed to have...I don't know how much influence she is supposed to have...She is the one that makes sure that we have all our tasks done, that we're keeping up with our lesson plan book, so she does have a big part in evaluating me in the end, I guess.

The ST seemed uncertain about the value or advisability of going to the US if a problem should arise even though "she seems to be the person who should be the mediator." ST felt that US was "moody" and that an approach to her would bring an unpredictable response. "It's kind of like what kind of mood she's in. Sometimes she can be just as sweet as pie...she came down on (classmate) really hard and I thought it was kind of unjustified and I really wonder why she did that." But the ST would go to the US if a problem arose and "just hope for the best." The ST does not feel that she and the US know each other very well.

> I've gotten very little feedback from her about what she thinks of my projects. She hasn't said 'Oh, I think this is real good' when you show her something so I'm not real sure how she feels about me. I see her every Tuesday in class. She gives a lot of constructive criticism in class - I think a lot of the things that she's saying is from her own experience, and maybe some common sense and other things are just good ideas to remember. She can be harsh in the way she criticized people in class. She gives ideas for teaching, a lot of reassurance, and she has a lot of philosophical or psychological things, ideas to give out--that is

what she should do. I think it would be good if she sat in and observed my class--she has never given me any sort of response, the couple of times that she has passed through the classroom--just a pass-through. I don't know if she is supposed to make up a formal evaluation at the end of the semester. I think we do get one eventually. After her looking in the classroom, I know we should have something.

In the final interview toward the end of the experience, the ST still maintained that although the US has been available when needed, she "was kind of moody." Even at this point the ST still did not know "How much of the US's opinion does matter." If it carried much weight the ST felt that the US had not been in her classroom enough to see whether she was "good, mediocre, or not very good at all." ST speculated that since what feedback the US had given was all positive, perhaps the US did not feel a need to observe her.

All Day Student Teaching

Toward the end of the training period the ST had one week of "all day student teaching" during which time she was, in effect, the teacher for the class. Her journal reflects her conflict and resolution of the issue of "whole class control or management." In preparing for the week, the ST met for a more concentrated and directed "conference" with CT. CT offered a "theme for the week" which the ST was "happy to follow along with as it made it easier in planning lessons." Just prior to "all day teach" ST reported that after organizing and planning with the CT she felt excited and confident and less nervous. She had taken "control" of the class several times as a help to the CT and felt that things went well. And then she began her time of full responsibility.

In her journal she notes:

It is really bothering me because I don't feel like I have much control over the class when it comes to group lessons. I felt like all the techniques to get them quiet didn't work well. I must take into consideration that there was a field trip and the class was very excited and still energized even after we got back. It was frustrating for me and I was upset by the situation. Right now, I'm not really enjoying this. I think it's because I have a lot that I want to teach but without the organization, classroom management and time I can't do all I want to do. I feel I spend so much time getting them quiet that time is lost that could be used teaching.

She expresses a desire to know what the CT is feeling about her at this point. In her own journal the CT wrote "I spent the day avoiding any contact with the children and they soon caught on that there was only one teacher today and I wasn't it!" The children "took outrageous advantage of the ST and she is the only one who can make it work for her...ST is well-planned, but not getting to all of her good plans because of discipline problems. She is being soft and gentle and almost pleadful and she needs to pin things down and demand different behavior--she's certainly seen me do this."

On the third day, ST noted in her journal that she really had a bad day. I just didn't seem to be in control. The children wouldn't listen to me and I finally decided that if they were going to waste work time by taking so long to get settled and quiet as a new lesson began then those wasted work minutes would be taken from their recess or lunch time. The number of minutes wasted would be spent practicing sitting quietly during recess or lunch. I hated being so upset with them but realized I had to be strict in order to regain their respect.

About the same situation, the CT wrote in her journal:

> Wednesday was a disaster. After school I shared with ST how I would be feeling if they were doing that with me. I would really be angry to see them behave for one person and knowing they could do it, misbehave for me! They would hear from me--and it is certainly not good for them either. We discussed what strategies could be used but she is the one who needs to decide what to do. (She needs the inner courage to know that she is in charge, not the children. To give many choices to children and to individualize and to think of their self-esteem as important does not mean chaos or disregard for the group. A key question.)

CT asked ST to "think about" who was in charge and "do what you need to do" alone with the students while CT left for twenty minutes or so the next day. The next morning the CT left the room and when she returned she found things "were in perfect order!" She noted that ST had used "behavior mod" which was "all that could be done in the situation" as she had to "be in charge" in order to allow them more freedom." In her journal the CT had added the word "paradoxal (sic)?"

The ST wrote that CT had suggested that she tell the class how she felt and had left the room to give her the freedom to do so. "That I needed. I did tell the students with sternness and sincerity that I was disappointed and unhappy. I felt they should give me respect and that I didn't like being angry with their behavior."

The day went much better, "not perfect, but so much better." CT told ST that she thought it went "super." And the ST drew a smiling face on her journal page. CT noted that things changed the next day. "ST became <u>in charge</u> and the children sensed the difference."

After "All Day Teach"

The "all day teach" week ended and the CT took the class while ST observed. The comments of both regarding this shift are revealing. The CT wrote that she instructed ST to "take a careful look at my dealings with the children--almost as if we start again. She's coming from a different view, now--and can be more critical about her observations." The ST reported a sense of relief that she did not have all the responsibility. She observed CT, focusing on the way she "maintained control and also kept her cool."

> Seeing her as a model again was refreshing. I am more aware of the little things now. Therefore, I think it is valuable and crucial to split the two weeks of all day student teaching that are required each semester. Gives time to reflect on the successes and mistakes of the first week before one begins the second week.

During the next week when the ST and CT were again "equals" in the classroom, the CT recorded that the children had been "high" and that both CT and ST kept them "calm." She noted that ST had "really learned a lot from her all day teaching." ST recorded

> I got super frustrated with the children again. CT had gone out of the room and in cleaning up and getting settled as a group on the rug, the children were extremely noisy. Feeling at a loss of how to gain control I just raised my voice and expressed my anger. I told them how upset I was and explained that when I asked them to be quiet--I MEANT IT! I told them I felt they were not giving me respect and that when they asked me something I didn't ignore them! I felt so much better expressing how I was really feeling and they were quiet then! CT came back into the room at the end of my speech! CT told me that a student had said to her during a time that I was teaching that a child who was acting up wouldn't

be doing that if the CT were teaching because the CT was 'mean.'" In her journal the ST wrote "The CT isn't 'mean' she just doesn't let anyone get away with anything!

The ST noted that during her all day teaching she had learned that she had to be stricter or the children would take advantage of her. She wrote that she hated raising her voice but knew that she had to "since I had to get control before the teaching, learning and fun can begin." The ST noted that in her job as noon aide at the school "I do yell when I need to and I do have control."

About class control the CT wrote "The children settled down...since I was very strict, but they played every number they could devise (on ST)...I would really be angry to see them behave for one person and knowing they could do it, misbehave for me!" The next week she reported "The children are high this week and (ST) and I are both keeping them calm! (ST really learned a lot from her all day teaching." (Author's underlining.) What she had learned, the ST reported, was that "I had to be stricter as the children began to take advantage of me. I hate raising my voice but know I must."

Conclusions

The high degree of compatibility and the ease and smoothness of the working relationship between the CT and the ST resulted in an almost two person experience, supporting the suggested analogy of the dance. Within this analogy, the US played the role of stage hand and audience, providing help upon request and being an appreciative observer. Contributions made by the ST were acknowledged and problems which arose during her interactions with the students were approached by the CT as opportunities for learning. Problems were attended through discussion and analysis in terms of desired outcomes and

the ST was encouraged to work out her own solution with suggestions from the CT which she was free to reject or modify.

Permeating the entire experience for all three members of the triad was the assumption that "experience is the best teacher," and that believing will make it so: "if you just have the confidence and know that you can do it, you can."

In spite of the cohesiveness, the mutuality, the agreement between the ST and the CT, in spite of the extremely high evaluations of the ST by both the CT and the US, in spite of the positive feelings of the ST regarding the experience, in spite of the indicated growth in conceptual level, four major problems were revealed by the qualitative data.

1. There was no evidence of any articulated, codified and agreed-to knowledge base regarding either the content or process of teaching or the content or process of training the student teacher.

2. Assessment, instruction and evaluation appeared to be dependent upon personal experience and idiosyncratic criteria.

3. Concern with time management seemed to rest on two premises: the need to "fill" classroom time and the need to reduce out-of-classroom time tasks.

4. There appeared to be a lack of clarity about ends and means, a conflict between a reactive and proactive stance with regard to instruction.

This case study suggests that conceptual growth or development can occur even without being an articulated goal of the student teaching experience provided persons are open to development, the environment is conducive to development, and there is a consistent source of support.

Additionally, this case study suggests that while conceptual growth or development may be desirable and even necessary as a training outcome for

teachers who will be required to function in complex environments with diverse groups of students, it is insufficient to assure knowledge-based decision making. Teachers functioning at higher levels may possess the capacity to process greater quantities of information in more complex integration but if there is a deficiency of information, the behaviors generated by the more complex analysis are likely to be inadequately linked to desired outcomes.

## Triad B

### "What We've Got Here is Crowd Control"

If triad A could be characterized as a developmental dance, triad B might well be presented as a three months Basic Training course in crowd control. In this analogy, the CT was the soft-hearted but business first, by-the-book sergeant; the US was the ninety-day wonder, idealistic first lieutenant; and the ST the well-meaning, bumbling, good ol' raw recruit.

The cooperating teacher member of this triad focused on behavior management and pressed for increased skill in obedience training of the class. The university supervisor admired the CT. The student teacher cried--a lot.

#### Background

The student teacher is an Anglo female, 22 years of age, planning to teach special education at the elementary level. She listed her father's occupation as "landman;" her mother's as teacher. She grew up in a middle SES suburban community and indicated that she ranked in the top 25% of her high school.

The university supervisor is an Anglo female, 24 years old. Her father is a high school principal; her mother an elementary teacher. She grew up in a small town, middle class community, attending schools which were 98%-99% Anglo. She finished high school in the top 10%, majored in elementary education at the university, and taught for two or three years in a small

rural school in which the majority of the students were lower SES. The ethnic makeup of the school was 99% Anglo. She secured the position of university supervisor of student teachers through the efforts of a friend, and accepted the responsibility in large measure for the financial assistance it provided as she entered a masters program. She had earned three graduate credits at the time she began this assignment. In an interview with a RITE staff member, the US said that she had had no specific training for working with student teachers but that she felt she was able to profit from experience. She felt that her responsibilities included trying to help the student teachers to be more effective as far as getting along with principals and cooperating teachers and she felt that required common sense more than anything. She said that she relied heavily on her ability to profit from experience and her common sense as she felt inadequate because of lack of education, lack of teaching experience, and lack of training and/or experience as a university supervisor.

The cooperating teacher is an Anglo female, 35 years old, in her second year of teaching at the present location. She has recently earned a masters degree in education, focusing on the training of student teachers. She referred repeatedly to the information and skills which she gained through this program and asserted that without it she would be unable to work adequately with student teachers. She grew up and attended schools in a middle class all-Anglo suburban community. Her student teacher in this study was the second with whom the CT had worked.

The school in which the clinical experience took place was a low SES urban elementary school with less than 500 students. According to the CT, the class was integrated, with slightly over 50% of the students being Anglo. An observer from the RITE project reported counting 6 Black students, 5 Anglo,

and 8 Hispanic students during the first classroom observation. The Hispanic students all speak English so there was no language problem. The CT stated that there were no "strong" students in the class, no "real outstanding leaders" because the school had a "so-called gifted" program which "skims off the cream of the crop." There were just a few "good average" students left in the class, the majority being below average, according to the CT.

Interpersonal Relationships

In terms of interpersonal relationships within the triad, the ST viewed the relationship with the US as less than helpful. On instruments provided by the RITE program she indicated that conferences with the US were infrequent and not useful, that the US had not allowed her enough independence to develop her own teaching style, and had not provided her with personal support during the student teaching experience. The ST also felt that the US did not observe frequently enough to adequately judge her performance.

In direct contradiction, the US stated that the conferences had been frequent and useful, that she had been supportive of the ST and that she had allowed the ST independence to develop her own teaching style. She felt strongly that she had provided encouragement to the ST on a personal basis, and that she had observed frequently enough to adequately judge the ST's performance. Both the ST and US agreed that the US had been available when problems arose.

On instruments provided by the RITE study the CT agreed with the perceptions of the US rather than those of the ST, stating that the US had allowed the ST freedom to develop her own teaching style, provided her with encouragement on a personal basis, been generally supportive of her teaching, and had visited and observed the ST frequently enough to be able to judge her performance. The CT and the US both indicated that their relationship with

each other had been positive and productive. The US ratings of the CT were excellent: positive in all areas. The CT was equally positive with regard to the US. The ST was very positive in her rating of the CT on all points, indicating that the CT had been helpful, supportive, and encouraging.

Expectations, Evaluations and Satisfactions

On the formal university evaluation form, using a rating scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being "unsatisfactory" and 5 being "high degree of excellence" the US gave the ST an overall performance rating of "3+." Lowest factor ratings were in "competence in planning" and "skillful implementation of learning plans," both of which fell halfway between "minimally acceptable" (2) and "satisfactory" (3). The only factors in which the ST received commendable ratings were health and vitality, communication with adults, and ability to profit from feedback. In her narrative comments on the evaluation form the US stated: "Because (ST) does not feel completely comfortable with the content level and demands of classroom management in sixth grade, I believe that she would function most competently with younger children."

The CT also rated the ST as "satisfactory" (slightly above a 3 on the marking scale) in overall performance and noted in her narrative comments that (ST) "is a conscientious person and a cooperative co-worker," recommended that she teach "primary or lower intermediate pupils" and suggested that "she and her pupils will benefit by her efforts to broaden her own intellectual background." Under the section on the evaluation form which calls for citing observable behaviors the CT listed: "Demonstrated facility with questioning techniques. Frequently used higher-order and open questions. Distributed questions among all pupils. ST can broaden her own intellectual background to enrich her teaching."

Responding to 29 statements provided by the RITE study, the ST indicated that by the end of the experience she felt she had created an enjoyable classroom atmosphere, been effective in managing student behavior, demonstrated skill in the use of creative and thought-provoking questions, and she was ready to begin teaching in her own classroom. She marked a neutral response to the following statement.: "I was not adequately prepared for class." She agreed with the following: "I did not demonstrate an adequate knowledge of subject matter."

On a RITE instrument the CT indicated that the ST was prepared for class but was "not effective in managing student behavior." On the formal university evaluation the CT marked the ST's performance as "satisfactory" in behavioral management. The US felt the ST was not prepared for class but on the formal evaluation gave her a slightly higher than satisfactory overall rating. The CT felt ST was not effective in managing student behaviors; US felt ST was effective. US felt strongly that the ST did not demonstrate an adequate knowledge of subject matter and the CT marked "neutral" response to the item. US marked "neutral" regarding ST's readiness to begin her own teaching assignment; US felt students were not able to learn new content and skills introduced by ST.

Both CT and US consistently rated ST high on questioning skills, high order type. Observations and perceptions of RITE staff members did not support this evaluation. During a classroom observation of the ST's performance, made in the second month, the RITE observer recorded that the ST sat on a stool in the front of the room, read a narrative about the ocean and asked the students to react to it in general. There wasn't much response. The observer was unclear as to what the ST was attempting to elicit from the students, so examples of the questions which the ST asked were recorded.

"Does anyone know what oceanography is? What sort of things can we get from the ocean?" Holding up a globe the ST asked, "What do we mostly see?" The ST moved from these questions to a discussion about how much water human beings are made of. One of the students raised her hand and asked, "What if you're dehydrated?" An awkward silence followed and then the ST asked, "Can anyone answer that?" A boy raised his hand and answered, "That's where you don't have enough water." The ST said, "Right," and then directed the students to clear their desks and get out a piece of paper and a pencil. She then instructed them to discuss with their neighbors their general impression of oceanography and to write it down. The students became too noisy and the ST turned the lights off and on and said "No more talking, just write for about five minutes."

A second RITE observer was in the room two weeks later. The lesson at that time was on bees and the observer wrote that the questions which the ST asked appeared to be comprehension level or recall type questions. Again, examples of the questions were recorded. "What is the name of the special jelly that the bees feed to their young? Why can't a bee sting you if it's full of honey?" A student interjected a question, "Is it true that when there's one bee that's a dead one the worker bees have to go back and get it, and the dead bee is heavier than the other ones?" The ST said "I don't know. That's interesting. It's kind of like what we mean by the phrase 'dead weight'." The ST then asked the students to give the meaning of a word which the observer was unable to understand from the ST's pronunciation. The ST then said, "It's on page ..." and her voice trailed off. She flipped through the pages of the book for about a minute while the students waited and then asked the class "Can anyone find it?" A girl seated nearby got up, rushed over to the ST, pointed it out in the book and said, "Oh yes, it's on the

first page, in the first paragraph, in the first sentence even." The ST said "Good, (X), I want you to read it real loud."

A third observation by a RITE staff member about three weeks later recorded the ST's questions to the class as she presented another lesson from the oceanography unit. The focus of this particular lesson was waves. The ST asked "Has anyone seen a tide?" A student attempted to answer by describing it. The ST asked "What does it look like?" A student replied "It's rushing in." The ST asked, "What happens to all the bays?" A student replied, "It knocks them over." The ST then asked, "If the tide is rushing in, what's happening to the bays?" A student answered, "The water rises."

It is difficult to determine what the CT and the US have in mind when they praise the ST for the use of "higher-level or higher order questions." The RITE observers recorded a continuing flow of the questions but it is difficult to find many which could be classified as "high order."

Perhaps such questions as "Why is it important that we have tides?" are regarded as such, but the interaction with the students does not support the idea that these are used for moving the students toward analytical thinking. The ST asked a student, "What do you know about waves?" The student responded, "They come up and knock you down." The ST then asked the class, "What do you think about that answer?" There was no response from the class. At a later point the ST asked, "If you were on a beach and you heard that a sunamous wave was going to hit in about thirty minutes, what would you do?" Sample answers from the students include: "Steal a motorcycle and get out of town. Hijack a DC-10. See how fast my legs could take me." At this point, according to the narrative of the observer, students were laughing and the lesson seems to end. The ST said, "We're going to be late for lunch, put your

things away and get ready." The observer commented, "This is not a particularly smooth transition."

The final RITE observation was made near the end of the student teaching experience. The RITE observer noted that at the beginning of the observation the ST was asking recall type questions of the students. The observer indicated that later in the lesson the ST had asked "slightly more interpretive type of questions." The example given was a question about a story the students had read. "What do you think about that? Was the father trying to trick him?" When a student answered, "No," with no further explanation, the ST asked, "Well, do you think this house was old? Did it make lots of creaky noises?"

The ST reported that she had been less able to handle behavior problems and relate personally to the students than she had expected. She felt that she had established herself as a teacher better than she had expected. Her expressed satisfaction with the experience was about the mean of the RITE study sample (Table 5).

The CT reported that she had spent more time than she had expected planning lessons with the ST. She felt that the ST was less prepared for the student teaching experience than she had expected her to be. The CT reported that the US had provided more competent supervision better than she had expected.

Interactions and Perceptions

Commenting in her journal regarding her first observation of the ST in the classroom, the US wrote that she hoped ST would soon take some "incentive" as the ST just sat at her desk in the back of the room observing the class. The US noted that she stressed to her student teachers the need for "incentive" in looking for ways to help the cooperating teacher. The context

of the statements seemed to indicate that the US wanted the ST to take "initiative" in being active in the classroom, as this author was unable to identify a motive or stimulus the US was implying by the use of "incentive." Four days later the US reported in her journal that the ST had been "very quiet" during the first seminar in which most of the student teachers were eager to talk, and that the ST had excused herself early in order to be on time for another class in which she was enrolled.

The CT recorded her perceptions for the first time two weeks after class had started. In her first journal entry she wrote that the ST "seems quite shy and a bit immature...though nice and I do like her." The CT also noted that she had "mixed feeling about wanting to help her and being pulled by other time demands." For the first of many times, the CT reports on the helpfulness of the university course she had just completed which prepared her to deal with student teachers. "I felt good to have the pacing guide all prepared and ready to discuss." She noted that the ST seemed "anxious," adding "I think sometimes that the level of anxiety for some STs is rather debilitating." In an interview with a RITE member three weeks later, the CT reinforced her feeling on this: "at times I'm not sure student teaching should even exist. I think that's a tremendous handicap, to step into somebody else's classroom. You don't want to step on toes. You don't want to step on your US's toes. You don't want all the kids to hate you. I think it's just terrible." The CT had taught in a small school for several years before doing her own student teaching in order to get her credentials. She had had a supportive principal and had felt confident and competent in her teaching situation. Then, when "I got in student teaching, it was like that middle management thing. You're one step up from the kids and one step down from the teacher, and you're right in the middle and who do you please? And

who- oooohhhh, it's terrible!" Her own student teaching experience, she said, had been a "terrible" one. She had gotten no help from the CT and "had to be assertive with her and tell her she was not following proper procedure." Her US had "backed her up" in her protest. The only reason she had agreed to be a CT herself was because "it's part of this special MEd program" in which she was enrolled. Her primary responsibility as a CT, she stated, was "to help the ST learn that she can solve her own problems. Not only right now, but in the future, in teaching."

The first recorded conference between the CT and the ST occurred at the end of the first three weeks. The CT noted in her journal that it was a rather significant day:

> We were having an Instructional Feedback Conference, taping, too. I was just showing (ST) the data that I'd gathered on off-task behaviors that she'd listed as concerns when (ST) reached over, turned off the tape and cried. I certainly didn't insist on taping again right then...I tried to use my best listening skills, but she couldn't or didn't choose to articulate clearly what the problem was.

The conference itself provides little clue as to the source of the tears but it did show relatively clearly the method which the CT used to direct the activity of the ST. The CT instructed the ST to "come up with a concern, something that bothered you about the pupils' behavior, something that makes you feel uncomfortable or that you would like to see changed." The ST stated that one of her concerns was that she had trouble with students not paying attention at times. The CT paraphrased "so you say inattentive type of behavior from the students bothers you?" and then asked "Can you tell me exactly what kinds of things they are doing that you don't want them to be doing?" "Sometimes," said the ST, "they poke at the other students. They

talk. Sometimes they are doing other work when they are supposed to be doing something else." "O.K.," the CT responded, "so by inattentive behavior you have mentioned poking others, talking and writing on other work. Is there anything else?" After the ST allowed as how she couldn't think of anything "right off" the CT mapped out the next steps.

> The first thing you are going to need to do is let me observe when you teach today..and get an idea of what is actually going on, to what extent these things are happening and in order to do that what I'll do is make a seating chart of the reading group that you are working with and tally what is going on so I could use a P for poking, a T for talking, and a W for off-task writing...So what I will do is get a measurement and then we will get back together and see to what extent this may be a concern or it might not be anymore.

The ST said, "O.K." Throughout the semester the ST frequently said "O.K." or "right." In the 14 recorded conferences, between September 25 and November 24, the ST made a total of 934 verbal statements to the CT. Three hundred twenty seven of these statements were simply "O.K." or "right."

Three weeks into the student teaching experience, the ST made her first journal entry: "I've been in the classroom for three weeks now. It's been rough." She expressed a positive feeling for the CT and the US. "My CT is great. She really knows what she's doing--with the class and with me...She is very supportive of me (she'll back what I say to the class; that is in the discipline area)." The US had made an observation visit on the day of the journal entry and the ST reported that students had been "medium good" and that she needed to work on "getting their undivided attention." About the US, she wrote, "I like my US. Her presence isn't to (sic) threatening--but I do respect her."

The US had an entry in her journal for the same day and wrote with regard to her observation that ST had been "assertive" and prompt in beginning the lesson but that the introduction to the lesson lacked "conciseness and strength." The US also noted that the ST used "repetitive speech (ya'll and okay)" which the US had called to her attention in the "feedback."

A few days later the CT and ST conferenced regarding the ST's concern about student behavior. Both ST and CT wrote in their journals on that day. The CT began the conference by asking ST if the students' poking and talking and writing were still a concern for her. The ST responded, "No, not so much. They are not so bad about that anymore." The CT then began to probe for another concern on which to focus. With this prodding the ST suggested that off-task behavior during the last ten minutes of class might be a problem. The CT followed her training format: "What I can do as far as totaling the data right here is put number of off-task behavior per one minute. I observed for seven minutes. And what I can do is get a rate per minute per average. If you want a total for later on." The CT pushes for specificity, for the ST to "state the behavior" to tell her "What sort of things (students) do that I could observe." The ST suggested, "Oh, talking, wiggling." The conference, like most of the others which were recorded, followed the pattern of the CT pushing the ST to select and state a "concern" which she "wanted to work on" in regard to classroom practice, and to describe the concern in terms of specific student behaviors which the CT could observe and factor in a tally and frequency table. The focus of instruction and guidance for the ST then would be either the extinction or reduction of undesirable student behaviors or the introduction or increase of desired student behaviors. Selected behaviors were specific, discrete and limited. Success of the ST performance could then be determined by the increase or decrease of the stated behaviors.

The CT seemed most pleased and complimentary of the ST for buying into this system she regarded as a "problem solving approach."

The CT's journal expressed her frustration with the lack of time for working with the ST. She did not seem to feel that the communication between the two of them was as open as it might be, stating at one point that although the ST had said that she wanted to continue with the research study "I'm not sure she'd tell me if she didn't."

The ST suggested in her journal that perhaps improvement in student behavior might be attributed to the fact that a lesson was taped. "They're always quieter when they know they're on tape." Regarding the conference and the "concern" on which they were focusing, she wrote:

> (We) had a conference over my concerns. My biggest concern is losing the group's attention--it starts dwindling away towards the end. So (CT) is keeping a tally of student behaviors, wiggling-talking-playing (off-task behavior), for the last 10 minutes of each time. I think if they were involved in more challenging work they wouldn't be bored like this.

The ST also commented on the results of the US's observation: "We had a seminar today. It wasn't to (sic) interesting but I did get my evaluation from her observing on Monday. It said I needed their undivided attention. I knew it would say that."

One month into the experience the ST wrote that the kids in her reading group were still having behavior problems. "My teacher took a tally. It was pretty bad--awful! I really think their work is too easy for them. They've all had these skills before." The CT's journal presented a different perspective:

> ST was in tears again today. I'm worried and will speak with her US. We were doing an evaluation conference and she said she thought the number

estimated..was looking terrible...I believe I've given her very specific directions about improving classroom control...and urged her again to copy the list I use that lists skills for behavior management. I'd given this to her before but she'd forgotten to copy it. I know I've mentioned its importance several times. She (ST) changed her concern in conferences a couple of times so we haven't progressed to actually seeing some changes. Next week should see some real progress if she follows plans to change pupils calling out. I think she'll feel better when she sees she has a hand on pupil behavior. She did finally express her frustration with the kids' conduct with her.

The concluding exchange between the CT and ST during the conference seemed indicative of both the focus and the problem of the student teaching experience. The CT has gone over the evaluation with the ST and emphasized the need for improvement in the area of "behavioral management," then asked the ST "How do you feel about this, your evaluation?" The ST responded, "The thing about behavioral management...just really crack down?" The CT answered, "It seems to be something that you have been aware of."

Following the first evaluation of the ST by the US and CT, in which the ST received numerical marks on various aspects of teaching performance, the relationship among the three and the thrust of the training experience seemed to be set. The following journal entries trace the development of the training and the responses and perceptions of the participants.

From the journal of the ST:

> This has been a rough week (so what else is new). My evaluation wasn't exactly up to par--just average. My work has been just average. I cried and cried (for the umpteenth time this semester)...I'm looking forward to tomorrow cuz (sic) I'm gonna show

slides - over King Tut. I hope the class likes & gets something out of them.

The US wrote:

(ST) showed slides of the King Tut exhibit...the vocabulary was much too sophisticated for sixth graders. Children soon became disinterested and misbehavior occurred. (ST) seemed unaware. She did not give any introduction to the presentation. Overall, I'm afraid she was not prepared...I told (ST) that we needed to discuss her unit plans which I consider to be incomplete. (ST) left the school 30 minutes early (going out of town)--I felt she should have been more concerned about discussing her unit with me. (CT) expressed concern over (ST's) lack of seriousness toward student teaching.

And the CT wrote:

I realize that, because (ST) has had difficulties handling the load of student teaching, I haven't delegated enough routine tasks, like grading papers, to her. Consequently, while she was off for a football weekend, I spent hours and hours working on school tasks. This is a real problem for me, and a no-win situation, because I feel guilty if I get behind at school and miserable if I feel I'm neglecting my child and six-month-old baby. Maybe anyone with a baby should not have a student teacher! Today I showed (ST) some tasks I'd given her to complete weeks ago and they still aren't done (I'm glad I had set up a notebook for that purpose, so we have a record of everything. I certainly like (ST) and can see that she's had a hard time, but being sweet isn't going to get her into a good position as a professional.

Negative reports continue to appear over time in the journal entries.

From the ST:

> What a day! It has definatly (sic) been a low point in my life (How dramatic). My US came to observe and my lesson didn't go well. If there's any calling out I put name on board & add checks & there's consequences. It worked really well. But other than that everything was awful. I had forgotten to do a couple of things for (CT) & she told (US) that I had better straighten up or I'm not gonna get the evaluation I need to get a job - (that serious)- so (US) told me she wanted to have a conference. (US) told me all this. It made a lot of things snap. So from now on there's definatly (sic) gonna be an improvement in my work habits. Work, work, work! My new motto. It's really been upsetting cause I feel I'm more trouble then (sic) I'm worth.

From the US:

> (CT) expressed further concern over (ST's) lack of incentive, planning--general conscientiousness...(ST) seems to lack confidence to an extent that it inhibits her perspective...I expressed my confidence in her and she thanked me for informing ("warning" was the word she used) her. She remained composed and I was a little surprised (and relieved) as (CT) has told me of emotional outbursts--(tears)...(ST) is being assertive (in classroom) and I feel she will achieve a comfortable technique for classroom management. I am most concerned about her continued lack of preparation.

By the middle of the second month the CT reported:

> (ST) is feeling better, I believe, because I showed her data from

observations showing she is eliminating (almost) the calling out behaviors of pupils...I feel very positive about the instructional feedback process I've learned when it works so well. And when it doesn't work it is very clear why. Then the ST has not changed her own behavior enough or needs to try some other alternatives from the list...I feel super about this part of working with STs...ST brought in a progress chart...It was to go up on the wall for the year. Lines weren't straight and it was somewhat of a mess. I felt sad, but did say it wouldn't do, and showed her how to measure to make a graph...We laughed and smiled, but I know it hurt...(ST's) behavior management is still poor. She is having trouble being assertive with pupils. They are taking full advantage, of course.

The US's version was a bit stronger:

(ST's) classroom control was much better though she is still relying heavily on the assertive discipline--i.e., at the beginning of each lesson outlining consequences of misbehavior. This really comes across negatively--but (CT) confided today that the students had been "running all over" (ST) and that she was having to "bear down" today, (CT) also said that (ST) had cried during their weekly conference again and was apparently suffering a lot of anxiety from worrying...(CT) said that (ST) has been much more conscientious so I suppose our talk was effective. I saw ST crying on the phone in the teachers' lounge at 8:15 this morning...I wish she would communicate with me.

Focus of Pre-service Training

Toward the end of the second month discipline or management of classroom behavior had emerged as almost the total focus of the training experience. Journal entries and recorded interactions between the ST and the CT during conferences provide a rather vivid picture of both the perception of the CT with regard to the responsibility of a teacher and the expectations of the CT with regard to training outcomes of the student teaching experience. Relying heavily on what she has been taught in her MEd program the CT frequently spoke authoritatively of her confidence that her methods and behaviors are "supported by research." For example: encouraging the ST to use a call to parents as a method of gaining compliance from students who call out without raising a hand first, the CT stated that "a teacher can make a judgment that a child's behavior is disrupting learning...In fact, all the research would back a teacher up on this. Classrooms where calling out is occurring..." At that point, the ST interrupted to ask, "So you would call parents and say..." And the CT responded, "I would, yes. I feel very supported by research in calling the parent and saying 'This is not allowed in my classroom and this is a teacher direction I've given to the pupils and it's a school rule that they are to follow teacher directions' and that's something I feel real comfortable with."

When the ST still failed to demonstrate the desired degree of control the CT became more direct and descriptive in her explanations at later conferences.

CT: Are you basically a person that doesn't like to give orders? Doesn't like to get tough with people?

ST: I guess.

CT: That's unfortunately part of this job. . . . It's more of being

able to speak in an authoritative tone, like "You need to take your seat right now." Practice that. Practice that with a tape recorder. Just in your own privacy practice saying things like that and then listen and see if that sounds like a person you'd obey.

---

CT: I think as you teach more and you're with the kids more, I think you'll get fed up faster with some of the stuff that's going on. You'll get fed up with it and realize that you're gonna have to eliminate it.

---

CT: We're not expecting perfection. My gosh, I certainly don't have perfect classroom management but it's acceptable and I'm afraid what you've got right now is not minimally acceptable, it's just...the kids would run over you.

---

CT: It (student teaching) is the big time, you know, and you haven't been prepared for it by your observations at all. I mean it just didn't help. It helped maybe understanding how to teach somebody something which is nice...It's crowd control type stuff that we're doing here. Whereas I think some of the techniques that you've using with the kids are the kind that work beautifully if you've got four or five kids.

---

CT: Unfortunately, the behavior management is the big thing that principals look at so you really want to get that up there especially in the special education because you're going to have the kids in special ed that are often a problem.

---

CT: You might have to take away some privilege or, you know, have something...use marbles or use whatever that you can kinda hold over their heads as a whole group...

And in her journal the ST expressed her frustration and determination in terms of the training outcomes as she had come to perceive them.

> Tuesday was awful. My score for behavior management was below minimally acceptable. The kids were running all over me & I was letting them get away with it. So on Wednesday I was firm and they were 99% better! I was happy, (CT) was happy & so was (US). I can't relax a bit. I've got to stay on my toes & show them that I mean business 100% of the time! Those kids (the problem ones) are NOT going to ruin my student teaching experience!

Despite the problems that appear in the journals and conferences, the three way evaluation of the ST's performance at mid-term indicated that the ST was making satisfactory progress in her training. "Not great," the ST wrote in her journal, "but at least it wasn't just terrible!" Again she focused on classroom management, writing, "I've got to improve in classroom management. I've got to get tough & firm! It's the only way I'll survive."

In the third month, the CT wrote, "I'm beginning to think of (ST) as a conscientious person who will work hard to do well...considering all the anxieties she suffered, I think she is carrying on quite well."

At a mid-semester interview with a member of the RITE staff the ST said that she felt she had a clear perception of her duties and responsibilities: to be punctual, to be present, to be energetic, to be always on the ball and to be aware of student learning. At the top of her list of priorities would be to maintain classroom behavior--that she considered to be the most

important factor. She felt that at first her students thought of her more as a pal, or just didn't "look at me with authority." By mid-semester she felt the students had started to accept her more as an authority and to realize "they have to listen to what I say." Her mid-semester responses to the RITE instrument designed to measure self-perception indicated that her self-esteem was at a very low level. She marked that she considered herself more imitative than creative, more passive than dynamic, more rigid than flexible, more uninformed than informed, more pessimistic than optimistic, more insecure than self-confident and more dull than stimulating. An entry made in her journal at about the same time that she took the inventory reflected the same lack of self-esteem.

> Student teaching is the most nerve racking experience I've gone through. I feel like I'm always being watched & evaluated. I'm petrified! Anyway today was an okay day. I started teaching math. There were a couple of things I had trouble with in division. I was kind of uptight cuz (sic) I have such a math phobia--anyway (CT) helped me out and answered a couple of the pupils questions for me--I hated that but--what could I do -

Total Teach

All three members of the triad became more positive during the ST's period of "total teach." The US still expressed concerns regarding the ST's lack of academic preparation but wrote in her journal that "classroom/behavior control has improved so much since this semester began--it is a real joy to see!" The CT had expressed her concern to the US about the ST's lack of "content knowledge" and suggested that ST might be more comfortable with a lower grade level. The ST wrote in her journal, "I have a super weak background in math."

Perceptions regarding the success of the unit which the ST conducted were discrepant. On the same day that the ST wrote in her journal, "lesson went great," the US wrote in her journal, "(CT) suggested that ST and (neighboring teacher) work together--but ST is relying on (other teacher) totally for ideas and materials and her planning is very unorganized and lacks continuity. ST seems to want to do well but lacks organizational skills."

In spite of the more positive comments, conferences continue to focus on management: off-task behavior during the last 10 minutes of class; moving the class in an orderly way from the classroom to P.E. or from lunch back to the classroom. Journal entries continue to indicate behavior problems. From the journal of the ST:

> Reading drives me crazy--low group are not working well independently & are disturbing my teach time with (other reading group) - I'm gonna try some different strategies - checking there (sic) work before math - sending notes home - I'm desperate-

From the journal of the US:

> (ST) conveyed her displeasure concerning student behavior during a panel discussion and made a comment that disturbed me, "Stupid kids. They don't appreciate anything. They make me so mad." This incident/attitude is troublesome for me.

Conference narratives indicated that CT continued moving along with her clinical supervision "system," focusing on a "concern," "collecting data," and giving "feedback" on the data to the ST.

> CT: Okay. There are three things in there I can look for and record as data: the poster, a reminder of some things that they need to do, the library system has been changed. And you are going to check at 10:00.

The ST was not as receptive to the idea of teaching a lower grade as the CT is anxious to push the idea. The ST wrote:

> (CT, US, and RITE staff member) were in the classroom evaluating me. I was a nervous wreck to say the least...(CT) thinks I should teach a lower level - maybe 4th grade - I'll have to do some serious thinking. I want to teach special ed but I'm not limiting myself to that field only - It's rough when someone tells you your academic background is weak. I've got to really study what I'm going to teach.

From the US's journal about the same day:

> (ST) was unable to accomodate (sic) for unexpected pupil responses and inquisition and consequently many excellent opportunities were neglected. (CT) has expressed her concern that (ST's) intellectual level is not adequate for the concepts and unde standing required for upper level elementary grades - today's lesson reinforces this belief.

The US seemed to be keenly aware that in spite of the ST's obvious need for help in the area of content and teaching, both the US and the CT have focused on management and control. She wrote, "We seem to have spent 3/4 of this 14 weeks on classroom management and control." The answer to the problem, she indicated, would be more time, a longer student teaching period so that "instructional techniques" and intellectual "deficiencies" could be addressed after the "basics" of control had been attended.

By the end of the third month the ST was still working on the problem of "getting kids to and from lunch in an orderly fashion." The CT was still concerned with the ST's intellectual deficiencies. The CT wrote in her journal:

(ST) did not have a sound grasp on some of the vocabulary and pronunciations. This has been a pattern and I've discussed it with her and with (US). (US) also was observing that discussion and agreed that she'd also recommend (ST) for a lower grade level...I'm uncomfortable about the intellectual level a teacher needs...and am not sure (ST) has it...I don't know that (ST), sweet and hardworking as she is, ought to be teaching above a third grade level if her own interests are as limited as they appear.

Journal entries near the end of "total teach" do not appear to justify the optimism expressed at an earlier point by the CT in regard to the ST's improvement with classroom management. The ST wrote:

> Today was not a very good day. (CT) was out at a workshop so I got the class by myself. I wasn't even worried because I really thought it would go smoothly, but I was wrong. The kids were crazy. They were throwing things - making rude comments. I had to send 2 to the office. By the time lunch rolled around I was a nervous wreck. They really pushed me to the limit & I hate to say it but I hated them today. I could have wrung every one of their necks...I'm glad I'm almost through!

All of the daily and continuing negative reactions and comments of the ST as she passed through the experience of "total teach" apparently were suddenly transformed at the termination of the experience. In an "exit" interview with a member of the RITE staff, she stated that her greatest success as a student teacher had been her total teach unit because the "kids learned and were real enthusiastic about it and participated well," She also told the interviewer that although "discipline" had been her greatest problem during student teaching, she had worked on that a lot and one of the biggest changes was when

"discipline turned over and they started behaving." The narrative of the final RITE observation made near the end of the training period appears to contradict this perception. The observer recorded that throughout the entire hour the class was in disruption by student misbehavior. An example from the observation narrative suggests that the ST was unable to deal with the situation. While the ST was asking questions such as, "What do you think of this story? Why do you think this is considered a snobby quality or characteristic?" two students were engaging in particularly overt negative interaction. A girl got out of her seat and went around the front of row one and came back to where a boy was seated on the left hand side of the row. She grabbed him from behind and choked and shook him saying, "Would you please give it to me!" Then she snatched a pen from his hand and went back to her seat. Then the boy got out of his seat and went over to the girl and started pulling the pen out of her hand. The girl got up and went over the US who was sitting in the back of the room observing and ask, "Miss (x), would you please tell him to leave me alone?" The US sent the girl back to her desk. Meanwhile other students were talking and being disruptive. Finally, the ST stood up and addressed the class, "Class, this is ridiculous. We have guests in the room now." The girl with the pen problem started to explain about the pen. The ST told her to ask the boy "nicely" for it. The girl replied that she had done so. The boy then made some statement which the observer was unable to hear and the ST told him to give the pen to the girl. The boy complained, "She hit me with it." At that point the ST told the girl to figure out a solution for herself as the ST needed to return to the reading.

This final RITE interview took place seven days after the ST wrote in her journal, "So many times I wonder if teaching is really for me. Sometimes I don't feel like I can cope."

Permeating the entire experience for all three members of Triad B was the assumption that in a training situation the trainer knows the right way to do things and conveys that knowledge to the trainee who is responsible for consciously following instructions and directions.

The US was herself in a learning process having just begun her masters program at the university, and indicated in her journal and in interviews with RITE staff that she was questioning, observing, "profiting from experience," and growing in her own knowledge and ability.

In Triad B, as in Triad A, the scores of the US indicated that she had experienced conceptual level growth during the course of the experience. But contrary to the situation in Triad A, neither the ST nor the CT gave indication of conceptual development growth during the period. The scores of the ST were the same on both pre and post Paragraph Completion test; the score of the CT on the post test was lower than her score on the pre test, indicating regression.

Conclusion

The clinical experience of Triad B was unquestionably a training process. From the beginning the relationship was one in which the CT assumed the responsibility for directing the activity of the ST toward specific ends by means of a rigidly fixed format. The US, lacking experience and training in working with the clinical training of student teachers, supported the process and perceptions of the CT. She felt that she made her own contribution to the experience by being supportive and using her "common sense" to help in keeping relationships harmonious. The role of the ST was to be hardworking and cooperative and to do well what she was told to do by the CT and the US. There was never a point during the experience where a sense of the mutuality such as dominated the relationship within Triad A could be identified.

The CT relied on the authority of "research" and her professor in the MEd training program which she had just completed in her persistence in a particular method of working with the ST. There was a way student teacher training should be done. There was a way classroom management should be done. The professor and research said so. And if one properly followed the proper procedure the desired outcomes would result. Therefore, when the desired outcomes were not evident, one obviously had not properly followed the proper procedure. In that event, as a last resort, one turned to threat. In the case of the students, parents were to be called; in the case of the ST, she would not get a job.

The case study of Triad B suggests that while training focused consistently and continuously on classroom management, using a clinical supervision technique, may be effective in reducing or increasing discrete, specific student teaching behaviors, it is insufficient to assure the development of competency in either "crowd control" or academic instruction. In addition, the training experience may possibly have contributed to the arrestation of conceptual development and even to regression in conceptual level functioning of the trainer. Factors related to the US as "learner," i.e., in her role as student in the Masters' program, appear to be more conducive to the positive change in her scores on the Paragraph Completion Test than factors related primarily to her role as supervisor.

## Triad C

### "Praise the Lord" and "Nit-picking"

Whereas the interactions among the participants in the clinical experience of Triad A might be seen as a sort of dance, and the experience of

Triad B as roughly analogous to military boot camp training, it is difficult even to perceive the experience of Triad C as interactive. All of the members of this triad are strong personalities, sure of the "rightness" of their own perceptions, positions, and behaviors, and confident of their own ability and competency. Each has a strong out-of-school identity. They shared a period of time together and focused on the completion of tasks assigned by role to each, with the ST functioning and reacting more as a "peer" role member of the triad than as a "trainee."

On-going entries in the journals of the ST provide insight into both her confidence and her strong position in the triad. These entries, along with her statements in both conferences and interviews, evince a strong orientation toward an absolute and simplistic authority-based "right-wrong, good-bad" world view along with an equally strong belief in the direct and protective personal intervention of God on her behalf. For example: she revamped a lesson and it went better and the student understood and she wrote "praise the Lord" in her journal. She taught a science lesson for which she had not adequately prepared and the CT thought it was "super" and ST wrote in her journal, "Praise the Lord! He is adequate through my inadequacies." By the middle of the term she was "bogged down" with grading papers, working on a unit and other activities but was able to get everything done on time, and she wrote in her journals, "The Lord really does multiple my time." Toward the end of the semester she wrote, "Well, my student teaching is almost over with. Praise the Lord! Maybe I can begin living a normal life again." By the end of the student teaching experience she had decided on a full-time job with a religious organization rather than teaching for the next year.

The CT and the US held equally strong and clear perceptions of what was "right" and what "should" be done or not done. All three gave unquestioning respect to "authority" and both gave and demanded "respect" in their encounters with each other.

Background

The ST is an Anglo female 22 years old, who grew up in a predominately Anglo middle SES suburban environment. Her father is an elementary school principal, her mother a secretary in a school district office. She attended mixed but predominately Anglo middle SES schools. She indicated that her general impression of the school she attended was "mostly favorable" and that her approximate high school rank was "top 25%." She indicated that she was strongly influenced by a religious organization to which she and her husband belonged.

The CT is a 28 year old Anglo female with seven years of teaching experience. Her father, now deceased, was a university Director of Placement following his retirement from a military career. Her mother is an artist. She was reared in a suburban middle SES environment and attended predominately Anglo public schools of which she had a generally favorable impression. She indicated that her approximate high school rank was "top 10%." She had a masters degree in Educational Administration.

The US is 62 years old, Anglo, female. She listed her father's occupation as School Administrator; her mother's as teacher. She spent most of her childhood in a very small town attending schools in which the SES of the majority of the students was low, and predominately Anglo. She indicated that her general impression of the schools was "mostly favorable" and that her high school rank was "top 2%." She holds a masters degree and has classroom teacher experience.

Interpersonal Relationships

The CT is cordial, capable, and highly organized, placing great emphasis on details associated with any given task. The CT's method or "manner" of relating to others, which she describes as "honest and open" often seems to distress the ST and is a point of concern noted by the US. The ST is clearly ambivalent about the CT's "honest" feedback. In one journal entry made during the first month the ST wrote "She is really honest and I appreciate the feedback she gives me" and "Even though her comments are not negative I believe she could put them in a more positive way." In a later entry the ST noted that the CT "is so honest which I appreciate, but she doesn't always say things real tactful." Still later the ST wrote that she and the CT had had a "rather degrading discussion" in which the ST felt that the CT "was being more critical than she needed to be--Believe me, she didn't encourage me."

In her first interview conducted by RITE the ST said that she felt the CT was "ideal" because she was "honest" and because on the first day the CT "wrote out my expectations" so she knew what she would be doing week by week. The ST also stated in the same interview that she would be able to know how she performed as a ST because the CT would "let me know and I wouldn't ask for anything more." But at the mid-semester interview the ST stated that when the CT said things with which she did not agree she did not listen because "I don't want to pick up things that are not good for me." Additional comments of the ST during this interview emphasized the ambivalence of her feelings toward the CT.

> She's a perfectionist and she's told me this--her tendency is to talk about others. She says, "Because I'm a perfectionist, sometimes I think I'm better than others," and it really has bothered me how she talks about others...To me it's gossip almost...

While the ST insisted to the interviewer that her relationship with the CT was a "good" one, she expressed less than positive feelings regarding their relationship.

> She's very critical. She's a very constructive person, but she's not very warm...when she tells me the good things I've done and then turns around...and doesn't put it constructively it breaks down. I just don't want to get close to a person like that...I've realized that's the way she is. She's not an ogre, really she isn't...I don't agree with everything she says but she has been good to me...She's been pretty helpful. She's given me a lot of feedback. I've taken it. Yesterday she gave me some feedback and I wanted to throw it back in her face. That's a bad attitude...My attitude was that I know how to teach. I don't need this criticism...I don't mean to brag by any means, but I feel like I know what I did wrong and I know what I could've improved.

In the final interview at the end of the experience the ST continued to express both views. She was positive about her experience and training, felt the CT had given her many good suggestions, had always told her when she "did wrong or right" and had showed the ST how she "really was as a teacher." On the other hand, reported the ST, one of the things which she valued least about the experience was "some of the remarks made by the CT," adding "If I don't agree with them I wouldn't take them." The CT had "admitted" to the ST that she was critical because she "was that way sometimes" but, the ST reported, "I didn't buy that. I don't think that's very good."

On the other hand, the ST's relationship with the US appeared to be consistent--pleasant and placid. In a journal entry near the end of the semester the ST summed it up, writing that the US "really has been a sweetie." In the mid-semester interview she said that their relationship was "good, real

good" explaining that the US had provided "encouragement more than anything." While she mentioned on several occasions that the US provided little "feedback" the ST apparently did not consider this a major problem and still felt that the US knew "what kind of teacher" the ST was. "She's more of a motherly type of figure or grandmotherly," the ST said regarding the US "She's real sweet, but she's more of that than a supervisor."

Both the US and the CT appeared to look upon the ST more as a peer than as a "trainee." Each was highly complimentary of her intelligence, ability, confidence, and performance in all areas. In the mid-semester interview with the RITE staff member, the CT said that she found it difficult to think of the ST as a "student" as she was so capable. In the final interview the CT reported that the ST was not "typical" but had come to the classroom "much better prepared than many other student teachers I've had in the past." On a number of occasions the CT commented that the ST was her "right-hand man" and that working with her was like having another teacher in the classroom rather than a student teacher in training.

On the formal evaluation the US gave the ST superior ratings commenting that she was "attractive, intelligent, and conscientious, used imagination and research to make her lessons interesting" and should make "an excellent teacher."

About the CT, the US noted in her journal, "she is vivacious and attractive" "has definite ideas about her role and mine" and that the CT was "obviously a leader among the teachers." The CT wrote that she found the US to be "more polished at her work than the supervisors I've dealt with in the past." and the "most cooperative US I've worked with."

In spite of the mutual praise and commendations of the US and CT, their relationship also appears to be an ambivalent one. The CT reported in her

mid-semester interview with RITE that her communication with the US was "limited to when she is on campus and pops in the door." She said that the US had not been very helpful but added "but then I haven't needed help." The CT said that she liked the US and pointed out that she thought it "very wise in her foresight" that the US "abdicated her role in deciding the final evaluation" of the ST.

The US expressed concerns regarding the CT. In her journal she noted that she had talked with a teacher who had been a ST of this CT. That teacher had reported that the CT "is a perfectionist" and that while a ST learns a lot from her "it is difficult to live with so much criticism." She noted in one entry that the CT seemed anxious for the ST to "appear in a good light" and so tried to explain the ST's performance to the US who was observing in the classroom. Reporting on the mid-semester evaluation of the ST, the US wrote that while the CT was complimentary regarding the ST, she "sensed a bit of tension between the two." On the evaluation form the US had given the ST some ratings that differed from those which the CT had given and the US felt that the CT "was upset because she had more 5's and 3's marked than I had." The CT had justified her own markings by saying that she had marked "like a principal would have."

Although the CT emphasized the US's "abdication" of her role in making the final evaluative decision about the performance of the ST, the US never mentioned nor gave any indication that she had done so.

Expectations, Perceptions and Satisfactions

On RITE instruments the US rated the performance of the CT strongly positive on all items with the one reservation that she felt the CT did not

provide the ST with encouragement on a personal basis. The CT's evaluation of the US's work with the ST was positive on all points. The ST echoed the US's feeling that the CT had not provided personal encouragement for the ST. The ST was positive about all aspects of the US's performance except that of frequent and specified observation and feedback. On the self-perception (self-concept) inventory instrument used by RITE, all three of the participants marked themselves in a highly positive manner. Both the CT and the ST indicted that they saw themselves as strict but both seemed to consider this a positive rather than a negative trait.

According to her responses on the expectation scale used by RITE, the ST liked seeing the students make academic progress and interacting with the students more than she had expected and liked less than she had expected seeing them make social progress. She liked managing behavior problems about as well as she had expected, and liked grading papers and planning lessons less than she had expected to. She found that she had been better able than she had expected to present subject matter, relate personally, meet individual students' needs, to establish herself as a teacher and to handle behavior problems. She found that there was nothing which she was less able to do than she had expected.

The CT found the ST to be better than she had expected a ST to be, and found that the US provided more competent supervision than she had expected.

The final evaluation of the ST was highly positive by both the US and the CT. The CT wrote that the ST was "a natural teacher, competent in planning, lesson implementation, classroom management, energetic, dependable, creative, and works well with children." She felt that the ST would be an "asset to any faculty."

The student teaching experience took place in a fourth grade class of 26 students. According to the CT, about a third of the students are lower middle SES, a third upper middle SES and a third low SES. The upper middle SES group are Anglo and the low SES group Mexican-American. She had, the CT reported, representatives of both "academic upper crust and academic lower level."

A clear, unquestioned perception of both task and process appeared to guide the actions and activities of the members of this triad. Both CT and ST indicate a desire to know what is expected of them by perceived authority, and seem eager to please and/or satisfy those expectations. When they are in the role of authority they try to make clear their own expectations and expect students to try to comply and to please them. They seem to feel that the person in authority is in charge and can be superseded only by a higher authority; the teacher instructs the learner; the learner cooperates, respects authority and improves; the teacher is pleased; the learner is happy and appreciative of the teacher. Success is desirable, and is determined by approval of the authority; conformity is rewarded with approval and pleasant experiences. The teacher is liked and obeyed if the expectations are clear and reasonable to the learner, if the teacher is understanding and sympathetic to limitations of the learner, if the authority expresses approval and encouragement, and if there is no conflict with a higher authority. Punishing behavior seems to be regarded as undesirable but something the person in authority is forced to do as a function of the role in order to make the learner improve, for the learner's own good. Specifically, the overall intent seems to be to get ready for some next stage or phase; fourth graders must be readied for fifth grade, student teachers must be readied for their own classrooms.

There is no questioning of what is right, only of how to get the right thing done. On the ST's first day at school the CT planned out a continuum of responsibilities for the calendar days that the ST would be working with the class. The listing was general but clear and specific. On days one and two, for example, the ST was to "learn names, procedures and politics." During the fourth week the ST was to teach spelling and English using plans of her own, teach one reading group using plans which the CT provided, teach Math group I one day, and Math group II another day, and order film for the social studies unit. In the final week the ST would teach one reading and one math of her own choice on two days and have scheduled observations of other classes three days.

Eighteen days after the ST began work with the class, the CT wrote that the ST had "exhibited excellent teaching ability thus far," noting that the ST was "mature, organized, conscientious and thoughtful," and had become a "natural" part of the class. On the same date, the ST wrote in her journal that she was having problems with the "lower" group, perhaps because "they just don't listen." She wrote that she found working with the "high" group much more enjoyable but that she was beginning to realize from feedback from the CT that she needed to call on students from the lower group more often. "I guess I'm afraid they won't be able to answer any of my questions so I just skip over them. However, I'm seeing that when I do call on them, many times it gets them back on task."

The ST at this point expressed only positive reaction to the "feedback" she was receiving from the CT, and disappointment at the lack of feedback from the US.

CT is providing me with anecdotal records three times a week which I am

finding real helpful. She is really honest, and I really appreciate the feedback she gives. I would like more feedback from the US--she has not been in to observe me once.

A phenomenon appears at this point which continues throughout the training period and which is absent from the other triad relationships. The ST verbalizes her evaluative impressions of her observations of the CT, apparently using criteria which she feels characterizes "good" teaching and upon which she relies in asserting at a later point that she knows how to teach and how to evaluate and correct her own classroom performance. She had observed the CT conduct a lesson on change in which the CT had the kids jump up and down in their chairs to see how their pulse would change. The ST considered the activity too noisy and noted "I really think there would of been something better."

Focus of the Training: Experience and "Nit-picking"

Two factors appear to converge to generate "training" activities in this triad: the peer status accorded the ST and the importance each of the participants places on the successful completion of assigned role responsibilities--the sense of supererogation as a virtue. Statements and actions indicate that all three consider the performance level of the ST at the beginning of the experience equal to that expected of a beginning teacher. At the same time each appears anxious to fulfill the obligations of her job, to do well what is expected of her as a function of her job. What emerges, then, is an alternation of peer level sharing among the three based on the assertion that ST possessed prior to the training period those skills one is expected to acquire during the clinical experience, and periodic instances of what the CT terms "nit-picking" in which she engages in minute criticism which the ST and sometimes the US consider unjustified.

In her first interview with the RITE staff, the ST indicated that for her the purpose of the student teaching experience was to "practice skills" in a sort of "apprenticeship" situation and to "pick up ideas." She also indicated that she wanted a "lot of structure" but freedom to be creative, "liberty within a given system" and said that she expected the ST to judge her performance. She said that she felt the most valuable thing she could do for the students would be to "motivate and to encourage the kids in a way that they'll like school." Her long range goals for her students would be to teach them "responsibility" to teach them "right from wrong" and teach them "what's good and what's bad." The outcome she hoped for in doing this would be that when they got out of elementary school and went to junior high they "wouldn't get involved in this or that." She hoped that in teaching them "a way of life" in addition to "knowledge" she would help them to become adults who "wouldn't use drugs or smoke dope." She seemed to feel comfortable with her understanding of the characteristics of a "good" teacher: one who knows what she is teaching and who is a "good disciplinarian" but "flexible," and who does not get emotionally involved all the time. She said that she felt teaching was one of her "gifts," although it was not an "automatic thing" for she needed to always "improve" on it. But she felt that she had been shown enough in her observation and methods block to be prepared for classroom management, that she knew what to do. She felt strongly that she had the interpersonal skills necessary for teaching. "I think I'm sufficiently endowed. (CT) will tell you I'm the most competent student teacher she's ever had." She felt that the clinical experience would prepare her to "become a good teacher." She was there to learn and to practice her skills. "I'm soaking everything up like a sponge. I'm trying to soak as much as I can, so I think it's mainly to practice my skills and to learn as much as I can from

my CT." She expected the CT to evaluate her performance in terms of whether she was doing a "good job" but she would also watch the kids' "mainly facial expressions" to determine her effectiveness as a teacher. She did not expect to have problems because she would be "totally, totally prepared" and have "back-up things" to use during her total teach.

While she expected the US and the CT to fulfill their role responsibility she felt herself primarily responsible for the outcomes of her training. "You know they can only do so much, and then I've got to do the rest."

The CT stated in her first RITE interview that she felt the most important responsibility of a CT was to give the ST the "opportunity to experience some of the things that they will have later on." She didn't feel that a person could be trained in interpersonal skills "to interact with young children" but that the ability to do that "comes with experience."

In her second interview she reported to the RITE interviewer that she was having trouble remembering that the ST was a student because she was so "capable." The CT felt that the ST was more like a "veteran right-hand man in the room," and so she found herself "nit-picking." She did this because the ST was "such a natural" that it was "hard to guide her without being too picky." Even in the area of classroom management, the CT felt that the ST was capable, and indicated that this was unusual because most student teachers had a problem with this area. "This is the first ST," she reported, "who actually took my advice and came on strong from the beginning, and now she's able to slack off and she hasn't had any problems."

In the final interview with the CT, she emphasized that ST was "not a typical student teacher," but was "very mature" and had come into the classroom "much better prepared" than previous STs. CT reported that she had "never had a ST who was able to take control so quickly." The ST was "a

natural," "creative," "flexible," and "resourceful in discovering things to use in dealing with the various concepts at hand. She felt that her relationship with the ST had been "excellent," although there had been some communication problems in the beginning. "I can come on a little strong with people because of my bluntness and my openness--I leave no holds unbarred, as they say."

The clinical experience of the CT had not been a particularly good one. She reported that her own CT had been absent quite a bit and that she had acted as a substitute, a "sink or swim situation." However, she felt that "in a way it could have been the best thing that ever happened to me. I had to learn."

She felt that she was a good CT. She reported that she had not needed any help from the US who had been impressed with her ability. The US had told her that she had noted her techniques in supervising...the way she outlined the programs and organized things, and wished that other supervising teachers would "put things in that perspective and be as caring" as the CT. But, the CT reported to the RITE interviewer, "that's my nature."

In the mid-semester interview the CT reported that her greatest success to that point was

> having the ST tell me how pleased she has been with my guidance so far and how appreciative she has been with my openness and honesty. In the past I have had problems because I am so honest sometimes--it's to the point of being blunt--and it has been offensive with some STs. But this particular ST has been reassuring that to her that was a help.

In her final interview she said her greatest success during the semester was

> some of the little things the ST has said and done throughout her entire

teaching experience. She has made many statements and outwardly taught in ways that showed me that I have been effective in the things I tried to do and that she has been appreciative of my technique. It went more to heart for me because her father is a principal, and being an administrator, he had kind of kept tabs on what's been happening, which I did not know at the very beginning. And even today, she was saying that she had shown her dad for the first time all of the data she has collected and all anecdotal records, and so forth. And he commented to her many things in agreement with what I had stated. In talking with her just a few minutes ago, I felt very good inside that we've worked something out and she is appreciative.

The US said in her first interview that she felt the purpose of the clinical experience was "to spare the ST from making the mistakes the US and CT had made, so she could make her own." She felt that she could teach the ST "lots of little tricks of the trade," "like if you think a class might be unruly or might pose a disciplinary challenge, be at the door ready to greet them and ready to start when that bell rings." She felt that it was essential for a good supervisor to have diplomatic skills and "a real desire to get along with the people involved." She felt a good teacher should be "caring, unselfish, dedicated, hardworking," a person who "continually reexamines teaching skills and effectiveness and tries to improve." She felt "bad" about the people who got into student teaching who did not like working with children or just "didn't have the knack or the talent for it."

In a conference taped midway into the semester the CT and the US discussed the performance of the ST. The CT stated that the ST had the "firmest handle" on discipline of all of her recent STs and agreed with the US that it was attributable to the "air of confidence" which the ST exhibited.

They discussed how strong the ST appeared to be in evaluating the level of understanding of the students following a given lesson and of her ability to "re-teach" when necessary.

Journal entries and conference statements trace the progress of the experience of the ST and the "nit-picking" of the CT from the beginning to the end of the semester. On the first day the CT gave the ST a detailed outline of the responsibilities which she would be expected to complete with the date when each would be due. Both the US and the ST reported positive feelings about the CT providing this guideline. The US noted in her journal that the CT had "thought out the semester thoroughly in some detail." Two weeks into the semester the CT wrote in her journal that the ST had "exhibited excellent teaching ability," that she was a "very mature, organized, conscientious and thoughtful person who has become a 'natural' part of our class." WRiting on the same day, the ST indicated that the CT was providing helpful feedback but expressed some dissatisfaction with the way the CT expressed her criticism. In the same entry the ST commented on the degree of agreement between herself and the CT with regard to classroom control. "One of the boys was really disrespectful today. CT gave him a demerit. To me, a teacher should always demand respect or the children will walk all over you. CT proved that she believes the same way."

Less than a month into the semester the ST wrote that the CT had been out of the room and the ST had the entire class all morning. She thought it went great. "US came in and was impressed with how the class was under control." She wrote that she was more assertive when the CT was out of the room.

The ST also reported on a problem she had had in teaching a lesson. "I taught pendulums again and the kids played with them like they were toys.

After talking I knew it was mostly my fault, I never stated my objective for the student thus they didn't know what the purpose was."

The CT's entries during this early part of the term are positive.

ST continues to exhibit very professional and responsible habits. I have asked her to have lesson plans ready on Thursday for the next week. She has them ready much sooner. On her own initiative she rewrote English plans to reteach a lesson which had not been as successful as she hoped. Students have accepted ST's authority in the classroom. I have never had a ST who was able to maintain discipline and respect from the students as quickly as ST has. I have been very honest with ST...I always try to state my comments in a positive way but if I have observed something I feel could use improvement I will make such suggestions--example, 'I do feel you need to be more discreet in handling individual discipline problems.

The ST noted in her journal that the CT had been particularly impressed with her ability to control the behavior of an emotionally disturbed child. She wrote that the CT had been worried that ST would let the student control her. But after seeing the interaction in class when the ST got control of the child the CT no longer had that fear.

The CT wrote that she was disturbed because the ST seemed to see the CT as "perfect."

I felt as though we'd taken 6 steps backwards when she told me that about (thinking I'm perfect!)...I do have high expectations for myself and my STs, but I am flexible and understanding. I think that until our talk today the communication between us has not been totally open. I have always been honest with her. She has been wearing a mask of sorts trying to please me.

The ST wrote in her journal that she had talked with the US who had told her to remember that the CT was being "picky on small things because she can't find big things to pick on." The CT wrote in an entry about the same time,

> ST had another fine morning of teaching! She is such a natural teacher. I explained to her that if I seem "picky" at times it is because there is nothing major to correct. I asked if my "little corrections" were taken in the manner they were given--as only helpful hints. She told me at first they were not but now she understands and appreciates my comments. For example, I suggested she not mark all over students' papers when grading. We talked about it and she worked out the reasons why I'd made the suggestions.

Data from recorded conferences provide examples of the method used by the CT in guiding or correcting the performance of the ST. The CT provided the ST with a number of instructional units which had been developed by other teachers on the topic which the ST would be teaching. In the course of the conference the ST asked if she might "just use ideas" from the units. The CT told her that the unit were merely "resources."

> If you don't feel comfortable teaching something, the kids aren't going to feel comfortable in learning whatever skill you are unclear on. So you come up with something that will teach the objective, but in a way you feel good about...You might be responsible at your given school for a certain unit. Now the district might hand you a stack of resources and say that these are things that other people have put together that the district has accepted, now you can put it together however you want to to teach the objectives the district wants taught in a way that is comfortable for you and the kids in your class...That's the way the real world is.

In a later conference the CT reinforced the importance of implementation.

> As long as I know that you have thought through the unit. That you really know what objectives needs to be put across to these kids, and then some, what they soak up, what they learn will show me what you've taught. It's not what you're planning that's important. It's how you implement it. Then if it's successful you'll know by the critique, but the different work they do on the worksheets and whatever else you have planned.

During one conference the CT tried to talk the ST out of using a particular game she had chosen for implementing a spelling lesson. The game involved the breaking of balloons and the CT felt there would be too much noise and chaos. The ST persisted in her intent of use the game saying, "Well, I think that that's the only way I'm going to learn if things work is just to try them out." The CT agreed with her and allowed the use of the game which apparently turned out to be a great success in both of their opinions.

The CT expressed her perception of the clinical training process to the ST during one of their conferences.

> This is your training period and it would be unfair of me to say. "I'm sorry, kiddo, you're on your own; if you botch it, that's your problem." We'll talk every day at our break time and we'll talk inbetween. If there's a concern that you have, I'm not going to tell you what to do about it, but I'll listen and if I see that there are some suggestions that maybe I should offer, then I'll do that. If you are having a problem as a full-time classroom teachers, you would probably talk to your peers; "Hey, I have this kid in my room that just doesn't want to turn in his work. Any ideas on how I can get him to start turning in his

work?" You could do that, I'm sure, so consider me a peer, the teacher next door that you're just talking to about these problems.

The suggestions made by the CT were concrete and specific. For example, during the discussion of a writing lesson the CT told the ST that many of the student would not know how to spell "peanut butter" so that she might make a word box on the chalkboard and "instead of arbitrarily saying here are some words you will need you might ask them and let them give you some of the words." The CT suggested that the ST might "do some air writing and let them model with you, writing in the air and doing the strokes" but added "you decide, use your judgement after you have had your discussion how much time you have left and whether or not they could use the additional practice of writing the questions..."

In comparison to the other triads in the study, there is an amazing absence of attention to training in classroom control or discipline. Both the CT and the US appear to consider the ST adequately proficient in this skills. The US reported in regard to the ST:

> She works constantly at keeping the children on task, uses positive reinforcement frequently, speaks positively, yet firmly, when necessary. She can put an edge to her voice, which is nice for me to hear. A number of young people have difficulty sometimes speaking as if they mean to be obeyed, expect to be obeyed. Children are quick to note the hesitancy...She seems to be aware of the whole classroom. I noticed this particularly on the day I was in here and you (CT) were not. She was able to keep the group going, and yet stopped to get somebody else on task...she managed to be aware of the whole class.

Classroom observations made by members of the RITE staff support this perception of control by both the CT and the ST. The narrative of the first

observation of the CT reports much student movement but that the class is well organized and work oriented. The CT seems to be aware of the behavior of all the students and keeps contact and control. She gives much positive feedback to the students and controls misbehavior with minimal negative interaction. Examples reported were: she put a finger to her lips and shook her head to get students to work quietly; she told a girl to "do your own work;" and said to the class, "I hear someone. Neighbor, would you give that person the quiet sign?" Observations of the ST indicate similar behavior, even a bit more controlling. The observer noted that in having the students move from place to place the ST had said, "I don't want to hear a sound as you go back to your desks." There was some noise and the ST said, "I said I didn't want to hear any sounds or I may cancel everything." The "everything" which was in danger of being cancelled, according to the observer notes, was a play which the students had spent considerable time in preparing for and to which they apparently were looking forward with eagerness. The students were quiet.

Apparently accepting the ST's level of performance as adequate in the areas of classroom management and academic instruction the CT focused her "corrections" or "nit-picking" on the ST's personal habits and "body language." In her journal the CT noted that the ST "continued to do a fine job in every aspect of her teaching" and then wrote: "Today I asked her not to chew gum in front of the students. She blushed and said, 'Oh, my gosh, would you believe I'm chewing a fingernail!" Five days later the CT wrote that the ST "appeared very worn" and that she was "picking up" that the week's responsibilities "are bothersome trivia keeping her busy when she'd rather devote all her energy to the next two weeks," which would be the total teach time. Two days later CT wrote that she had had a "long talk" with the ST and "expressed many of my concerns of late--specifically her lax attitude with

much negative body language coming across to the students." The ST had told a student "Oh, bull, that is not correct." and had rolled her eyes and almost looked disgusted at certain student responses. The CT reported that she had told the ST that she was a role model kids look up to and that she needed to portray a positive attitude. The CT concluded the journal entry with the comment that after she had "lowered the boom" there was a "remarkable change" and the ST had an excellent day with "very productive lessons."

The ST wrote that she felt in her teaching "the kids should come first, not how I perform for CT." She expressed concern about her ability to motivate students in "the lower group," but felt that she had been able to see some accomplishments. She perceived two main problems in working with these students: "laziness" and the fact that "many of them understood Spanish better than English." But she also found that they had "a problem staying on task." She reported in her journal that the CT had told her that if she could "even set a spark off with one of these kids" she should feel that she had really accomplished something. The main thing, she indicated, was "to get the lower students out their lazy habits."

The CT wrote that the ST had been "bothered" one week by the poor work habits of the slower group and the next week by the "know it all" attitude of the higher reading group. The CT told her "that only a miracle would provide her with a class of only normal, above average students" and the CT continued in her journal "such a perfect mixture would be boring and ST would again be concerned."

The entry in the journal of the ST concerning this discussion reflected a slightly different slant. The ST wrote that she and the CT had had a "rather degrading" discussion: and that the CT seemed "to think I am getting burned

which I am. I just felt she was being more critical than she really needed to be."

The three-way mid-semester conference was positive, with both the CT and the US very complimentary of the performance of the ST. However, the US reported that there appeared to be some "tension" between the ST and the CT. The CT noted in her journal that the ST had a problem in that her body language reflected her "moods" which directly affected the class management and interest level but evaluated ST as "doing a great job" and said that "her plans for next week look great." The ST wrote in her journal that the CT was always complimentary of her when the US was around and wondered why that might be.

During total teach the CT seemed to perceive the control of the ST as being almost too complete. The ST wrote "I was especially proud of myself for getting the kids out of reading on time." But the CT wrote about the same lesson:

> ST began total teach yesterday and the day went smoothly. Today she seemed hurried. I asked her why she was threatening with some of her requests, i.e., "By the time I count to 3 I want everyone in the reading group on the carpet or I'm going to write some ugly notes." She replied that she wanted to stick to a certain time schedule and the students weren't moving or making the necessary transitions as fast as she would like. We talked about this and she realized now that the problem can be worked out in a more positive way. We spoke of body language cues again.

An interesting occurrence toward the end of total teach might well serve as a picture of the relationship between the CT and the ST and of the nature of the clinical experience. Both CT and ST report the situation in their journals on the same day. The CT reported that total teach had gone well

during the week. ST reported "things have been going real smooth." CT reported "ST is prepared and sticks to schedule." ST reported "CT said I'm coming down on the kids harder--I guess that's because I'm concerned about the total management." CT reported "ST has been very strict this week. We discussed this yesterday and she seems to be more relaxed today." ST reported that she had gone ahead with the balloon game which the CT had discouraged her from using and that it "never got out of hand." The CT reported "I was pleased with the lesson ST tried with balloon popping. What could have been a wild morning was a roaring success." The CT wrote "ST says I'm picky. Both US and I have reminded her that other student teachers have more severe problems and are spoken to and guided through those problems. ST's teaching is just blossoming from a natural gift. We are just working out a few kinks." The CT recalled the interchange differently. She wrote "CT said again she thinks I'm not enjoying total teach because I'm too tense. It really bothered me that she said this again so I said 'I am enjoying this and I have loosened up.' She said she wouldn't worry about it anymore. There are still some things where she is being picky."

At the final evaluation the CT continued to emphasize the fact that although the ST "worked all semester to improve her body language and attitude reflected in facial expressions," "that is something she will always need to be aware of."

Conclusions

Both the CT and the US perceive the ST as skillful in the areas of control, management, and rule-governed behavior and competent in the handling of academic content. The ST appears to be both negative and positive in regard to the CT's perceptions of what works and what is necessary. While she does not "like" the "nit-picking" of the CT, she defends it to some degree as

necessary in the process of making her the best teacher she can be. All three of the participants seemed to be guided in their perceptions and behaviors more by craft knowledge of what is right than by any theoretical/philosophical/research ideas. All three of them view the competence of the ST as some sort of "natural" gift or trait or ability. And all three regard the clinical training as an opportunity for the ST to experience what she will encounter in the real world of teaching and to benefit from the experience of the CT and US in learning "tricks of the trade" and "working out a few kinks" in her performance. The CT acts out her expert status role responsibilities by being "picky" about details since she perceives the ST as entering the experience with the major competencies. The US fulfills her role in the process by sharing a large amount of craft knowledge, and by being supportive--"a real sweetie."

As a result of the training activities and experiences the ST emerges pretty much as she entered, but with a stronger sense of efficacy, resulting primarily from the approval and commendation of the CT.

The experience of this triad appears to support the proposition propounded in all three triads; that the most important function of clinical training is to provide opportunity for the ST to have experiences associated with teaching and to practice skills of classroom management and lesson planning and presentation.

For the ST in Triad C, the experience appeared to be more of an audition than a practice session. She got the part. Then changed her mind and took another job.

## Comparison of Triads

Intensive and detailed study of qualitative data collected during the course of these three different preservice clinical experiences suggests that

clinical preservice is simultaneously an idiosyncratic experience with activities determined to a large degree by the characteristics and craft knowledge of the participants, and a technological training experience with activities determined by a rigidly generalizable and predictable set of competencies which the ST is expected to demonstrate by the end of the training period. This reinforces the idea that the preservice program itself is "job training" on the one hand and preparation for the mission of "educating young people" on the other. Specific interaction and activities appear to be determined by the resulting dynamics. Expectations, satisfactions, perceptions, and evaluations appear to be related to the resolution of the tensions between these two views.

Personal Characteristics

The members of the three triads were compared with each other and with the total sample on four constructs: 1) conceptual level (Table 1); 2) empathy (Table 2); flexibility (Table 3); and 4) self-perception (Table 4). Appendix A contains copies of the instruments used to measure each construct. The conceptual level instrument was administered as a pre and post measure and the other three instruments were administered pre, post, and at the mid-point of the training period.

Scores on the dimension of conceptual level functioning indicated that all of the members of Triad A experienced development during the clinical preservice period. In Triad B the score of the US increased, that of the ST remained the same, and the final score of the CT was lower. In Triad C the final score of the ST was higher, while the final scores of both the CT and US were lower than their initial scores. On the initial administration the CT in Triad B had the highest score, the CT in Triad A next, and the CT in Triad C had the lowest score. On the post test the CT in Triad A had by far the

highest score of the three. The ST in Triad A scored higher on the initial administration than either of the other two STs and much higher on the post administration, on which her score was more than a standard deviation above the mean of the sample from which the case studies were drawn.

Scores on the empathy construct rating instrument indicated that the US, CT, and ST in Triad A were strongly empathic, the CT and ST scoring a standard deviation above the mean of the sample from which the case studies were taken. Scores of the members of Triad C also indicated a high level of empathy. The scores of the members of Triad B were all below the mean of the sample on all three instruments. On the final test the US and the ST scored a standard deviation below the mean of the sample and the CT scored a standard deviation below the mean on the first and second tests.

Results on the flexibility instrument indicated that the members of Triad A were more flexible than the members of the other two triads. The CT in Triad A scored two standard deviations above the mean of the first and second administrations and one standard above the mean on the final one. The members of Triad B appear to form the most rigid group. The CT and the ST scored well below the mean of the sample on all three administrations.

On the dimension of self-perception or self-concept Triad B again scored the lowest. On the final administration all members of Triad B scored well below their counterpart in the other triads. The ST in Triad B scored a standard deviation below the mean of the sample and the CT scored two standard deviations below the mean. On the other hand, both the CT and ST in Triad B scored a standard deviation above the mean.

The members of Triad A appeared to have had the highest self-concept, the highest level of flexibility, and the greatest degree of empathy, and to have experienced the most growth in conceptual development during the experience.

The members of Triad B appeared to have had significantly low self-concept, excessive rigidity, and a striking lack of empathy. The CT and US appear to have regressed conceptually but the scores of the ST in Triad B indicated that she experienced some conceptual development during the training period. All members of Triad C scored near the mean on the final self-perception test, and appeared to be fairly flexible and empathic. In this triad the scores on the conceptual level instruments indicated that the US experienced growth, the ST remained at the same level, and the CT experienced regression.

Outcomes: Satisfaction, Expectation, Evaluations

The ST in Triad C reported the greatest degree of satisfaction with the experience, the ST in Triad A the next highest, and the ST in Triad B reported the least satisfaction with the experience. The satisfaction instrument scores of all three of the STs were at or above the mean of the sample.

In terms of expectations, the outcomes for the three STs varied. For all three the orientation portion of the experience was far from meeting their expectations; the scores of all three were a standard deviation from the mean of the sample, indicating that their expectations in terms of orientation to the program were not met. In terms of competence, the ST in Triad A and the ST in Triad C reported that expectations for themselves were exceeded. The ST in Triad B, in contrast, reported that her expectations in terms of competence were not met: her score being a standard deviation below the mean of the sample on this item. ST in Triad A reported that she spent considerably less time than she had expected to spend on activities associated with the training; the ST in Triad B reported that she spent somewhat less time than she had expected to spend, and the ST in Triad C reported that she spent more time than she had expected would be required.

The final evaluations of the ST in Triad A by both the US and CT were the highest possible ratings available on the form provided by the university. The narrative comments of both the US and CT indicted that the ST was outstanding and would make an excellent teacher. Both noted her enthusiasm and reported that she was "hard-working" and "not afraid to take that extra time to provide the best learning experiences for each pupil." The CT also reported and emphasized with underlining that the ST was "in charge" when "it was necessary." The CT concluded the recommendation with the information that the ST was "flexible," had a "sense of humor," and a "wonderful perspective about teaching." In short, that the ST was "terrific!"

The ST in Triad C also received high ratings on her final evaluations by both the CT and the US although her ratings were not so high as those of the ST in Triad A. The US commented that the ST was "attractive, intelligent and conscientious," and would be "an excellent teacher." The CT wrote that the ST was a "natural teacher," competent in planning, lesson implementation and classroom management. In addition she was "energetic, dependable, creative, and worked well with children."

The evaluations of the ST in Triad B were less exuberant. Neither the CT nor the US gave her a single mark above 4 on a 5-point scale on any item. Her overall student teaching performance was rated by both the CT and US as slightly above "satisfactory" which was a numerical score of "3." The US wrote in her comments that the ST had "met the requirements of student teaching" but that she did not "feel completely comfortable with the content level and demands of behavioral management in sixth grade." Because of this, the US suggested that the ST would "function most competently with younger children." The CT commented that the ST was a "conscientious person and a cooperative co-worker," and recommended that the ST teach "primary or lower

intermediate pupils," where she and her pupils would "benefit by her efforts to broaden her own intellectual background."

## General Conclusions

The intent of this paper was to provide one facet of the general description of the clinical preservice experience: an intensive view of the ongoing process of the field experience.

1. There was no evidence of any articulated, codified and agreed-to knowledge base regarding either the context and process of teaching or the content and process of training the ST.

2. There appeared to be a lack of clarity about ends and means, a conflict between a reactive and proactive stance with regard to instruction.

3. While conceptual growth or development can and sometimes does occur without being an intentional goal of the clinical experience, arrestation or regression on this dimension is at least equally likely.

4. Conceptual growth or development is not sufficient to assure more competent teaching performance.

5. Satisfaction, fulfillment of expectations, and satisfactory performance evaluations of the ST should not be assumed to indicate that the experience resulted in professional growth and the acquisition of competent teaching behaviors.

6. Control of classroom behavior is a job requirement in and of itself, regardless of its relationship to any academic skill or knowledge.

7. Adherence to specific contextual mores is a prime requisite of successful completion of the clinical training.

8. Personal characteristics and the degree of match between perceptions and values of the members of the triad are highly predictive of the interactions and evaluations which take place in the clinical experience.

9. Craft knowledge and "common sense" are the basis of most decisions regarding specific clinical experiences.

10. One common assumption underlies clinical teacher education: practical in-classroom experience necessarily contributes to the development of better teachers.

References

Applegate, J. H., & Lasley, T. J. Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. Journal of Teacher Education, March-April, 1982, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, pp. 15-18.

Becher, R. M., & Ade, W. E. The relationship of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. Journal of Teacher Education, March-April, 1982, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, pp. 24-30.

Griffin, G. A., et al. The student teaching experience, research design for a descriptive study. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1981

"Michigan school gets tough, flunks 22% of its youngest!" Austin American-Statesman, Friday, June 4, 1981.

Sprinthall, N., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. Educating for teacher growth: A cognitive developmental perspective. In Griffin, G. A., & Hukill, H. (Eds.), Alternate perspectives for research and program development in teacher education. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, January 1922.

"Teachers closing book on careers." Austin American-Statesman, Friday, June 4, 1982.

Appendix A

HUNT'S
PARAGRAPH COMPLETION

Name _____

Directions

You are asked to write at least three sentences on each of the topics in this booklet. You should spend no more than three minutes writing on each topic or a total of 15 minues on all five. It might be useful to use a timer or check your watch. Please try to indicate as accurately as possible how you feel about the topic rather than how you think others feel or how you think one should feel. Begin with the first sentence stem. Write for three minutes. Turn the page and write for three minutes on the second topic, and so so. Do not go back over your work. There is no need for editing.

Thank you for your cooperation.

PLEASE TURN OVER

1. What I think about rules...

2. When I am criticized...

PLEASE TURN OVER

4. When someone disagrees with me...

5. When I am told what to do...

PLEASE TURN OVER

6. When I am not sure...

NAME_____

Date _____

# THIRD SET

This instrument contains 23 items that describe a way that a person may feel about another or act toward someone. Your task is to read each statement and decide the degree to which you perceive yourself, as like or unlike the statement. You are asked to please give an honest opinion on every statement according to the following scale:

| | |
|---|---|
| Extremely unlike | - 1 |
| Moderately unlike | - 2 |
| Unlike | - 3 |
| Like | - 4 |
| Moderately like | - 5 |
| Extremely like | - 6 |

Please read each statement carefully and completely. Circle one response for each item.

Copyright 1980 Elaine L. LaMonica.
Reproduced by permission of the author.

| No. | Items | Extremely Unlike | Moderately Unlike | Unlike | Like | Moderately Like | Extremely Like |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Cannot accept individual differences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. | Does not respect individual differences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. | Helps a person realize that options are available. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. | Is not concerned with the feelings of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. | Does not appreciate individual differences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. | Is responsive to the needs of the whole person. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. | Offers no support to others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. | Treats other people as if they were objects. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. | Seems inconsiderate of other people's feelings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. | Has no respect for the opinions of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. | Shows no sympathy for others during a crisis or stressful situation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. | Never even tries to comprehend another person's situation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. | Seems hostile rather than sympathetic when another person is in a trying situation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. | Feels that opinions and values of others should be respected. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. | Is uncooperative. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. | Makes time in a busy work schedule to talk to someone who is upset. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

| No. | Items | Extremely Unlike | Moderately Unlike | Unlike | Like | Moderately Like | Extremely Like |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. | Listens thoughtfully and patiently to another. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 18. | Shows consideration for a person's feelings and reactions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 19. | Does not seem to accept responsibility for his/her actions toward others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 20. | Reaches out and touches another person in a soothing manner when it seems right. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 21. | Gives genuine consolation, advice, assistance, and support. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 22. | Is kind, positive, warm, and accepting of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 23. | Respects the values of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

## DIFFERENT SITUATIONS ADAPTATION SCALE

This questionnaire is concerned with how people adapt to different situations. There is no correct or best answer. Please read each statement and decide whether the behavior is similar or dissimilar to yours. Read each statement carefully, and circle the number that best represents your opinion. In making your responses to each statement, use the following scale to represent your answer.

| | |
|---|---|
| Very dissimilar to me | - 1 |
| Moderately dissimilar to me | - 2 |
| Somewhat dissimilar to me | - 3 |
| Somewhat similar to me | - 4 |
| Moderately similar to me | - 5 |
| Very similar to me | - 6 |

PLEASE TURN OVER

| Items | Very dissimilar | Moderately dissimilar | Somewhat dissimilar | Somewhat similar | Moderately similar | Very similar |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Is quiet around strangers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. Has difficulty initiating conversations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. Has difficulty being at ease with new people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. Is nervous at meeting new people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. Is uncomfortable in formal social settings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. Takes active part in entertaining others in social settings. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. Is a good story-teller. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. Is embarrassed around people not well-known. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. Is bothered when something unexpected occurs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. Does not want to begin a project unless end results are known. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. Has difficulty setting aside a task once it is begun. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. Does not like uncertain or unpredictable things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. Has stereotypical views of men and women. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. Is uncomfortable unless dressed like others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 15. Avoids trouble at all costs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 16. Likes to do things the same way all the time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 17. Is uncomfortable in situations in which differences of opinion are aired. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

+++++

Sex: M F Name/Number _____

Grade/Level _____

SELF-PERCEPTION INVENTORY (T)

Form $SC_T$

People are different in the ways they think about themselves. We are interested in discovering what kind of teacher you believe yourself to be like at this moment. Therefore, you are requested to describe yourself, as you now are, by placing a check in one of the four spaces on the line between two words which are opposite in meaning. Each line represents how well the adjective fits your perception of your <u>self</u> as a teacher.

Example:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| quiet | ✓ | : | : | : | loud |
| | very quiet | : more quiet than loud | : more loud than quiet | : very loud | |

Look at the words at both ends of the line before you decide where to place your checkmark. Work rapidly; give your first reaction to the items, since your first answer is likely to be the best. Please do not omit any items and mark each item only once. Remember: there are no right or wrong answers--only answers which best describe yourself as a teacher.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | accepting | : | : | : | rejecting (1) |
| (2) | approving | : | : | : | critical (2) |
| (3) | articulate | : | : | : | inarticulate (3) |
| (4) | cheerful | : | : | : | sullen (4) |
| (5) | competent | : | : | : | incompetent (5) |
| (6) | considerate | : | : | : | inconsiderate (6) |
| (7) | consistent | : | : | : | inconsistent (7) |
| (8) | cooperative | : | : | : | uncooperative (8) |
| (9) | courteous | : | : | : | sarcastic (9) |
| (10) | creative | : | : | : | imitative (10) |
| (11) | democratic | : | : | : | autocratic (11) |
| (12) | dynamic | : | : | : | passive (12) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (13) | enthusiastic | indifferent | (13) |
| (14) | even-tempered | irritable | (14) |
| (15) | fair | unfair | (15) |
| (16) | flexible | rigid | (16) |
| (17) | friendly | unfriendly | (17) |
| (18) | humble | overbearing | (18) |
| (19) | industrious | lazy | (19) |
| (20) | informed | uninformed | (20) |
| (21) | just | punitive | (21) |
| (22) | lenient | strict | (22) |
| (23) | mature | immature | (23) |
| (24) | neat | untidy | (24) |
| (25) | optimistic | pessimistic | (25) |
| (26) | organized | unorganized | (26) |
| (27) | out-going | withdrawn | (27) |
| (28) | patient | impatient | (28) |
| (29) | pleasant | unpleasant | (29) |
| (30) | poised | awkward | (30) |
| (31) | respecting | disparaging | (31) |
| (32) | self-confident | insecure | (32) |
| (33) | sociable | shy | (33) |
| (34) | stimulating | dull | (34) |
| (35) | tolerant | intolerant | (35) |
| (36) | understanding | unsympathetic | (36) |

Copyright: Dr. Anthony T. Soares & Dr. Louise M. Soares, 1965, 1970; revised 1975.